Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 58 ST LOUIS, MO. SEPT. 1

SIDELIGHTS ON THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

By H. Vieth

I. *Origin of our New Constitution and By-laws.*

The writing of a new constitution is always a rather difficult business beset with many dangers. New constitutions usually are not written until it is impossible to continue functioning under an old one because there is no longer a legal basis for transactions that have become a custom. Often a large proportion of the membership is not aware just how far the old constitution has been outgrown and how many of its provisions are no longer feasible. Nor are they thoroughly familiar with the working of the administration and informed as to the new provisions required. This makes for a conservative attitude on the part of a great majority of the members of almost all organizations desirous of writing a new constitution. On the other hand, the element most familiar with the practical working of the administration as a rule is not satisfied with meeting the status quo, but wants to make a new constitution which will meet the developments of the future. This makes for a liberal attitude and progressive ideas among a portion of the members who are usually in the minority but have the advantage of position and administrative facilities.

A good constitution should be the result of a compromise between the two factions. As I look back now, it does appear as though the conservative element was not sufficiently represented on that commission. This was not intentional and, in all justice, it must be said, that the commission did carefully consider the conservative element and its opinions. There can be no doubt,

however, that if more conservative members had been appointed on that commission, much of the fear and prejudice with which the draft of the new constitution was received in certain districts might have been eliminated. To this distrust I ascribe the loss of much valuable criticism; for it led to an attempt to defeat the new constitution altogether or at least certain features of the new constitution. If the same effort had been directed not toward defeat but toward amendment, we might today have not only a better constitution but one which would have a far more universal support and the entire good-will of the church. I do not mean to infer by this that I consider the new constitution and by-laws a failure or that I believe the scheme or organization and administration which it inaugurates needs far-reaching and vital changes, but I do believe that it will now take longer than necessary for the new instrument to become really a part of the church. In this little discussion I would like to accomplish two things: first, to show that distrust and fear in the face of the new constitution and by-laws are unfounded; second, to point out certain features which might need amendment and thus to set in motion thought processes which may result in the proper amendment at the next general conference.

II. *Weaknesses of the New Constitution and By-laws.*

The weaknesses of the new constitution and by-laws may be roughly classed as intentional and unintentional. The intentional weaknesses are: first, the avoidance of the creedal issue, and; second, the lack of clarity in the definition of the respective powers of the board of directors, the general council, and the administrative boards.

1. The Avoidance of the Creedal Issue.

There are in our church today three groups holding divergent views on the creed: the Orthodox, the Liberal, and the Modernistic. The new creedal statement, which was defeated at Chicago, reflected the liberal viewpoint and, being distinctly a compromise, failed to satisfy any of the three groups. Lack of sufficient time led to the retention of the old paragraph. It is clear that this is merely a postponement of the settlement of the creedal issue, but a postponement that was intentional and could not be avoided. It constitutes a weakness because the paragraph is out of harmony with the balance of the constitution and by-laws. May I give it here as my personal opinion that a creedal statement has no proper place in the constitution, for a constitution defines the character of a church not through a creedal statement but through a statement of purpose. Hence from the standpoint of the constitution

it would be wiser to embody our creedal statement in articles of faith and have the constitutional paragraph refer to these articles of faith and make their acceptance obligatory for the members. This would remove the creedal from the constitutional issue and separate the legal and the theological questions.

2. Another intentional weakness of the new constitution is the lack of clarity as between the respective powers of the board of directors, the general council, and the administrative boards. The commission was well aware of this lack of clarity and intentionally left it so because of a strong conviction that greater clarity would have to come by practical experience rather than by authoritative statement. We are now in the process of developing these relationships and I am confident that they will adjust themselves even without constitutional changes or changes in the by-laws, though it may well be that, as certain factors prove themselves, they will be embodied and made clear by additions to or amendments of the by-laws.

Among the unintentional weaknesses of the constitution to which attention must be directed, first place belongs to the lack of any provisions for electing or appointing successors to members of the general council and of the district council who for any reason whatever cannot longer perform their duties.

Another weakness that needs to be eliminated is the fact that the election of delegates and alternates to the general conference is not stated among the functions of a district conference, and that there is no provision for the election of alternates and their required number under elections. There is no provision in the by-laws for the granting of furloughs though I am not sure that this properly belongs in the by-laws. If careful reflection should convince us that it does belong, then provision can easily be made. Suffice it to say that even under our present by-laws the board of directors has ample powers to grant furloughs to those entitled to it.

III. *Weaknesses of the Administration.*

It has long been a complaint among both pastors and lay-members that we had insufficient authority in the Evangelical Synod for such administrative acts as the welfare and growth of the church required. This weakness the new constitution and by-laws were to eliminate. A careful perusal of the by-laws will convince any leader that there is a definite assignment of administrative authority properly safeguarded as to the rights of individual members, congregations and districts. There has been apparent, however, in the new administration a certain unwillingness, one might almost say fear of exercising authority. It is perfectly nor-

mal and wholesome that the assertion of authority should be gradual, careful and cautious lest it lead to excess and violate fundamental rights of others. At the same time, it is vitally necessary that authority be asserted to stop the willful disregard, or even violation, of the provision of the constitution and by-laws. The voluntary submission to constituted authority is the first condition of true freedom and I think the day has come when we, the members of the Evangelical Synod, both lay and clergy, should demand authoritative action by those entrusted with authority in the interest of our own fuller and larger freedom. Without such an assertion of authority the only freedom we have left is the freedom to die.

Next to the fear of exercising authority, which still prevails in our church, the greatest weakness of our administration is fear of the judiciary. Before we had a judiciary, the settlement of judicial questions was in the hands of administration. This leads to either a total neglect of all judicial questions or to a definite weakness of the administration by an attempted settlement of judicial questions. Fear of judiciary has its root in the oldfashioned idea that it is a disgrace to be cited in court. The fact is that it is a much greater disgrace to try to settle differences by squibbling and squabbling or by long-drawn-out discussions at district conferences, which settle nothing, than by straight-forward appeal to that branch of our government which alone is authorized to settle such questions. Let us assume that a district president takes certain action in the firm conviction that he is entirely within his rights and that it is even his duty to do so. Let us assume that the president of the Synod differs with him and thinks that the district president has exceeded his authority. If the district president is not convinced, it is not only his right but his duty to appeal to the court to settle the question. I wish that we could learn to lose our fear of the judiciary and learn to consider it merely as a friendly arm of the government of the church for the settlement of such questions as naturally arise between us. As far as cases are concerned which involve punishment, it is far more honest, far more just, and far more loving to try a man's case in court than to try it by gossip, as has too often been the case with us in the past; for gossip can utterly damn a man without giving him a hearing.

Next to be considered is the lack of cooperation which always has been and continues to be a weakness in our administration. The strength of any administration is determined by the degree of cooperation it receives. Take for instance the matter of statistical reports. Their value depends on the following factors: exactness, completeness, promptness. Statistical reports should be

in the office by the first of February; they were not yet all in by the first of April. Yet it should be apparent that one missing report will detract from the value of the entire tabulation. One is again and again surprised at the lack of exactness in reporting. The figures do not balance. One will report the number of teachers for each department, and the total number of teachers does not correspond to the total sum of the teachers reported for each department. When it comes to reporting finances, the lack of exactness is sometimes appalling. Yet so much of our work must depend on the information contained in the statistical reports.

As far as completeness is concerned, many insist on determining for themselves what they wish to report and what to leave unreported. We have pastors who have made no report for a number of years, and we have one record of a pastor telling his church that it was not necessary for them to make reports, that the matter was entirely unimportant.

Another thing I might point out is our experience with the sending out of certain material. Take for instance the suggested program prepared by the general council for the regional conferences. Sufficient copies were mailed to every district so that each regional chairman might have a copy. Yet we are receiving almost every day requests for additional copies from persons who never received theirs. That is lack of cooperation. Or, take our Stewardship Essay Contest of this year, which was one of the outstanding methods of promoting stewardship. Of the twenty districts, thirteen cooperated, but of only seven can it be said that their cooperation brought real results. We should have had two thousand entries; we had about two hundred. As long as we have not learned to reason that only united and concerted efforts bring lasting results, our administration must always remain weak.

Another thing I would like to mention is the lack of understanding of administrative functions. Again and again I have been asked: "Why don't you do so and so, that would certainly be a wonderful thing." And sometimes these critics are right, it would be a wonderful thing, but we cannot do it either for lack of funds or for lack of equipment, or for lack of personnel. There are still a good many people who have an idea that all an executive secretary has to do is to sit in an easy chair at his desk, write an occasional letter and make an occasional trip partly for pleasure and partly for work. They seem to have no idea of the overwhelming mass of detail that comes to and accumulates on the desk of an administrative officer and that must somehow be taken care of and taken care of with the means at hand. Few people have an appreciation of the physical strain involved in an

extended trip to the field for the presentation of the work of the church. The writer was once scheduled to preach seven sermons on one Sunday. He had no choice but to carry out the program, but you may imagine what chance of a successful and forceful presentation there was with such a schedule. One of our executives delights in telling the story of a brother who once visited him in his office and his first question was for a rocking chair. He seemed to be greatly astonished that not a single easy chair was to be found in the office. He did not seem to be able to comprehend that the president of the Synod has eight hours of strenuous work for every day in the week. This rather wide-spread lack of understanding of what can and what cannot be done and of the time and strength involved in the doing of it is one of the causes of weakness in our present administration.

It will take time to remove it altogether but without a great deal of good-will on the part of our membership at large it can never be removed.

IV. *Difficulties of the Administration.*

Every administration has its own difficulties which are unavoidable and the result of the general conditions under which it functions. There is as a rule no reason to say much about them as they will be overcome in the course of events. There are, however, a number of difficulties, an understanding of which is necessary to the understanding of and cooperation with the administration.

The first of these which must be mentioned is the lack of proper records for the past. This is the very natural result of not having full time paid workers and a proper office staff and it will follow us for many years and is the explanation of certain actions and sometimes the lack of action that to the uninformed may present the appearance of inefficiency. For our present attempts to reestablish these records and make them as perfect as can be done at this late date, we should have a far fuller cooperation than we have so far received.

In this connection, I must point out our lack of sufficient help. I do not know how the impression was created that the various administrative departments of the Synod have a superabundance of help. There are certain periods of the year when we get along fairly well with our present office force but for the periods of intense activity we are still considerably understaffed, which means not only a certain amount of inefficiency, but involves a certain waste which becomes unavoidable when the work on hand cannot be promptly carried to a successful conclusion.

This condition is of course closely connected with our lack of funds which is an old complaint among us. The difficulties which arise out of this lack are, however, not yet fully understood among our members. As soon as our budget is raised, this difficulty will be done away with and we will be enabled to carry out our work far more economically than is at present possible. The extravagance that many fear would be the result of ampler funds is so foreign to our German nature that there need not be fear on that score.

The greatest difficulty with which we are faced lies undoubtedly in the indifference of many of our members. The lethargy of the membership can at times nullify all efforts of the most able administration. Government statistics in Washington declare that 80% of our ministers never answer a letter. Perhaps that is putting it a little strong. It is a fact never-the-less that much of the so-called inefficiency of our administration is due to nothing else than the total indifference of our membership towards our efforts at greater efficiency.

V. *Difficulties in the Field.*

The picture these last paragraphs show would be incomplete without a word said about the difficulties that are faced by our pastors and congregations and which in large part explain both the indifference and the lack of understanding which create the difficulties for the administration.

I want to call attention here to the insecurity of the position of many pastors and congregations. It would be impossible to enter into detail as to the cause of this condition and its possible cure. That would require a separate article. It may be said that about 30% of our congregations are finding their own positions so insecure that there is a constant fear in the minds of their members that they will be unable to continue. This fear very naturally reacts on their attitude towards the administration. The pastor in such a congregation must naturally have the feeling that his position is not secure and he fears that any attempt on his part to promote the Kingdom program of the administration would only tend to weaken still more the already hazardous position. For the pastor, there is an added insecurity which lies in the fact that he feels himself at the mercy of his congregation. Where a strong and magnetic personality is lacking or where, with the coming of the years, vitality is ebbing, this fear results very naturally in a certain hesitancy in stressing administrative affairs. While it is true that the administration cannot alone solve the problem of insecurity of both pastors and congregations, it is certain that it can-

not be solved without a strong administration. For the problem is greater than the individual church or the individual pastor.

Another difficulty is found in the insufficient information about synodical affairs which is at the command of the average pastor and congregation. This has a twofold root: On the one hand is the constantly decreasing subscription list of our periodicals and on the other hand the impossibility of reaching our entire membership by other promotional methods. The only present solution lies in the proper use of the regional conferences which may show, for those who make the most of them, the way out of this difficulty.

Insufficient or improper organization is another reason why things in the field do not go as well as we might wish them to. In spite of the constant cry of over-organization, there are still too many churches whose councils have no stated meeting dates and are inadequately organized to carry on the work of the congregation. This is especially disastrous in churches where the membership is small and needs to make up for the lack of numbers by efficient organization. The only remedy for this is the training of council members and prospective council members in order to help them to function more efficiently. This is now a part of our program and will be carried out in the near future.

Closely related to this is the lack of a real program in many of our churches. They are just drifting along and bemoaning conditions without having the least idea of how to overcome their difficulties, without realizing just what must be done to better their own situation, or inquiring into the methods how it can be done. The way out is always there, for the Kingdom of God cannot fail but many of them are too blind to see it or too indifferent to make an effort to find it.

This again is due to a lack of Kingdom vision. If a church is convinced that its only purpose and task is to provide its membership with an opportunity of worship and fails to see the vital connection between the congregational life and the life of the church and the growth of the Kingdom, there can be no progress in such a congregation. They will only become more and more convinced that their strength and resources are inadequate to the growing difficulties of their own situation. It is only when we catch the vision of the great purpose of God in building an universal Kingdom of Righteousness and conceive ourselves and our congregation as instruments of that great purpose, that we tap the invisable and inexhaustable resources of the Kingdom of God and discover a way out of our difficulties and over our obstacles.

VI. *In Conclusion.*

Times have changed radically and are still changing at a tremendous rate. The church must change, certainly not its message or its fundamental principles, but its methods and measures, to meet the new conditions. The modernistic revolt would never have gained its present strength if it were not for the fact that the church, by its antiquated methods and inefficient administration, hid the light of its message under the bushel of obscurity. In smuck complacency, and secure in the walls of its sanctuaries, it broke the bread of religious tradition and left the struggling multitudes in the wilderness of modern life without bread and without hope. There is as much power above and as much work below as there has ever been and there is no reason why the church should not be successful in carrying out any program of Kingdom building if it squarely faces the issues of the day with the power of God.

THE PASTOR'S LIFE AND WORK

By Rev. C. Loos

A paper read at the conference of the ministerium of the New York District, in session in Gowanda, N. Y., June 18th and 19th, 1930.

Frankly I confess that when this topic was assigned to me by the program committee of this conference, it was not altogether sympathetic to me, not because I failed to see the importance of it, or its good reason and opportuneness, but because I felt that it must involve necessarily criticism here and there. Some enjoy to criticise everything. This is easy, much easier than to live above reproach. Ministers by inclination and training are naturally disposed to criticize. Sometimes they are far too exacting and censorious where they had better be patient and charitable. Sometimes criticism is nothing but faultfinding, knocking and undue censoriousness. Such criticism offends and works nothing but ill. Our Lord had no patience with faultfinders who "cleaned the outside of the cup and permitted the inside to be filled with extortion and excess." Matthew 23: 25. The Word of God takes special account of the harsh, censorious spirit of faultfinding. "Judge not that ye be not judged." Matthew 7: 1.

But there is a sort of criticism which is helpful, producing a better understanding and appreciation of one another and a more efficient and proficient exercise of our profession. This criticism is born of brotherly love and is recommended by Paul in Galatians 6: 1, 2. "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye who are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness, looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ." The law of Christ is love. John 13: 34, 35.

So let it be understood from the beginning that if eventually we may lay a finger on a sore spot, such criticism is made in brotherly love with "Malice to no one and charity for all." We must respect and honor each other's opinions and feelings and convictions, honestly arrived at. I stand before you today not so much desiring to be a critic, but as a fellow-laborer, fully conscious of the sacredness, the responsibility, the difficulty and the joy of the evangelical ministry. I consider myself nothing but "unus inter pares," having suffered defeat where you have failed and enjoying fruit where you have been victorious. I am today in the ministry 38 years (being ordained June 19, 1892), and looking upon the way which I was permitted to go, I cannot but praise the grace of God, his patience and kindness. I can also say

conscientiously, that I have at no time been blind to the glory of my calling and of the ministry at large. Such consciousness has helped me more than once in the perplexing situations, such as come into the life of every minister, in seasons of doubt and discouragement, when we like Elijah of old flee to the secrecy of the juniper tree in the wilderness.

The remembrance of the sacredness and the glory of our calling is an antidote to a poisoned ministerial system. It was Paul's medicine in his many professional afflictions. But even as a "prisoner of the Lord" he does not cease to praise the grace of God which was given him, "the least of all saints." Ephesians 3: 1, 2, 7, 8. The abiding sense of the grace of God and the glory of his calling was the source of his growing zeal and unfading joy in the cause of Jesus Christ. Dr. J. H. Jowett in his Yale Lectures says "If we lose the sense of the wonder of our commission we shall become like common traders in a common market, babbling about common wares."

Perhaps this may be a little difficult to see for young pastors with little or no practical experience, but as time goes on the faithful minister will grow in understanding and will come to experience a joy such as no other work can give him. Reinhold Niebuhr in his "Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic" writes in 1915, the year when he entered his ministry: "There is something ludicrous about a callow young fool like myself standing up to preach a sermon to these good folks. I talk wisely about life and know little about life's problems. I tell them of the need of sacrifice, although most of them could tell me something about what that really means."

A little while later but in the same year he says: "Now that I have preached about a dozen sermons I find that I am repeating myself. A different text simply means a different pretext for saying the same thing over again. The few ideas that I had worked into sermons at the seminary have all been used, and now what? I suppose that as the years go by life and experience will prompt some new ideas and I will find some in the Bible that I have missed so far. They say a young preacher must catch his second wind before he can really preach. I'd better catch it pretty soon or the weekly sermon will become a terrible chore."

Niebuhr evidently caught "his second wind," for five years later he writes: "I am really beginning to like the ministry. I think since I have stopped worrying so much about the intellectual problems of religion and have begun to explore some of its ethical problems there is more of a thrill in preaching. A young woman came to me the other day in ——— and told me that my talk on forgiveness in the C——— church of that town several months

ago has brought about a reconciliation between her mother and her sister after the two had been in a feud for five years. I accepted the news with more outward than inward composure. There is redemptive power in the message! I could go on the new courage that came out of that little victory for many a month."

Still a few years later, in 1925, we read: "We had a communion service tonight (Good Friday) and I preached on the text "We preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumblingblock and to the Gentiles foolishness, but to them that are called the power of God and the wisdom of God." I don't think I ever felt greater joy in preaching a sermon. How experience and life change our perspectives! It was only a few years ago that I did not know what to make of the cross. At least I made no more of it than to recognize it as an historic fact which proved the necessity of paying a high price for our ideals. Now I see it as a symbol of ultimate reality."

You can easily see a steady progress upward in the appreciation and the experience of the joy of the christian ministry in these open and frank confessions of Reinhold Niebuhr. We honor him for that. And I believe that Niebuhr is only one of many who have made this same glorious experience. *If we once cease to believe that in the majority of our ministers there lies dormant a wealth of spiritual powers, an inward groping and seeking and determination for the expression and imparting of the mysteries and the unsearchable riches of the grace of God in Christ, then we may as well despair of the usefulness of the christian ministry and leave the world to its inevitable doom.*

The late Dr. Philip Vollmer said in one of his many helpful articles in the "Theological Magazine": "In my estimation, and speaking in general, the churches in America perhaps never had a more able, consecrated and efficient ministry than they are having today." (January, 1927.) I agree with him. Also with his following remark. "But there is always room for improvement." Yes, *those dormant spiritual forces in the ministry must constantly be awakened and kept awake. The source of power, through which we preach the mysteries of Christ, will run dry, unless we are regularly and systematically replenished with the life-giving Spirit which filled the apostles of 1900 years ago, and which is within our reach. The weight of our appeal will increase or decrease according to the degree of our spirituality.*

More Spirituality

is one of the outstanding needs of the present day ministry, in fact the need of the ministers of every age. Spirituality, or spiritual mindedness means a life fully and unreservedly under the

control of the Holy Spirit. It is not a sickly, sour expression of the face, a put-on artificial piety which repels rather than attracts a thinking man. Neither is it a false, rampant emotionalism, the best known exponent of which perhaps is Billy Sunday, who by his bombastic and boisterous rant is one of them of whom E. Stanley Jones says "The queer have queered Pentecost for us. So much so that one is tempted to leave out the word altogether." (The Christ of Every Road, page 48.)

Spirituality is the free and full expression of the Christ Spirit in the life of man everywhere and at all times. "The truly religious man," says F. B. Meyer, "will be as sweet in irritating gnat-stings as in crushing calamities; as selfdenying for a child as for a crowd; as patient over a spoiled or late meal as over an operation which summons all his manhood to the front." (Elijah, page 57.) Or as Mc Laren comments on Romans 8: 6 "To be spiritually minded means to be wholesomely and earnestly religious seven days of the week, in the home, on the street, in the place of toil, in the social circle,—wherever life touches the life of others." (Christian Family Altar, page 203.) *The most successful preachers have always been those who spoke from the hidden treasures of their inner life, from their personal inner harmony with God in their heart. This is not of their own. It is the work of the Holy Spirit.*

Alas that the average minister finds so little time regularly to keep his inner life on par with the needs as they are constantly before him in his daily and manifold activities, which so often test and drain his spirituality. The best of men have advised the busy preacher under no circumstances to neglect his private devotional life, Bible reading and prayer. If Jesus had need of seeking His Father in prayer constantly, how can we for a moment expect to do without it? "The victorious spiritual living," we read in E. Stanley Jones "The Christ of Every Road," p. 247, "is the outcome of prayer, selfsurrender, appropriating faith and constant adjustment of the human to the divine." A little later on he says "The technique of finding the Spirit is not arbitrary, imposed, unnatural. Rather it is natural, growing out of facts. It is valid today. THE FIRST STEP IS PRAYER and through prayer a drawing near.—But herein is our weakness,—our prayer lives are very ordinary, hence our spiritual impact is very mediocre. While in the West I stated publicly that the ministry was not praying. I did not mean that ministers do not pray, we all do,—but I did mean that *we are not praying in a way that brings self-abandonment, that self-abandonment in turn bringing a venturous faith which appropriates divine resources and leads to our receiv-*

ing the Spirit as a mighty working fact in life. There are wonderful exceptions, but on the whole we are using oars when we might use the power of steam. We are trying to organize life into being instead of being organism imparting life. In these modern days we feverishly run about on the surface in automobiles, and that surface running is symbolical of our surface living. WE HAVE LOST THE DEPTHS. Very often we are feverishly busy doing nothing, but feverishly busy. When we feel there is something wrong and that it is all ending in futility, instead of giving ourselves to prayer, we—appoint a committee! If a monument were erected over the dead situations in christendom, we might inscribe it "Committee-ed to Death!" We call a committee instead of calling to prayer, and the one is often an "alibi" for the other. *The fact is that our taste for prayer determines our taste for God."*

These are words which every pastor does well to heed. Dr. Jowett says to his Yale Students these significant words: "I am profoundly convinced that one of the greatest perils which beset the ministry of this country is a restless scattering of energies over an amazing multiplicity of interests, which leaves no margin of time or of strength for receptive and absorbing communion with God." And John Greenleaf Whittier teaches this beautiful prayer

Dear Lord, and Father of mankind,
Forgive our feverish ways!
Reclothe us in our rightful mind;
In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper Rev'rence praise.

Drop Thy still dews of quietness
Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy Peace.

Breathe through the pulses of desire
Thy coolness and Thy balm;
Let sense be dumb, its heat expire;
Speak through the earthquake, wind and fire,
O still small voice of calm!

The proper measure of spirituality is reflected in *the activities* of the pastor. The sphere of these is principally his study, his pulpit and the homes of his members.

The Pastor's Study

The pastor's study is his workshop. In it we find his tools, his implements and his weapons. A pastor's study, his desk and his bookshelves help me to make a fairly correct estimate of his work.

Again we say, alas, that the modern preacher, especially the busy city pastor, finds so little time to spend in his workshop. No wonder we hear again and again the complaint that the sermon is too lean, too poor, having neither punch nor kick in it, and therefore is uninteresting and unable to hold the attention of the people. The workingman complains of a lack of sympathetic understanding of his condition on the part of the church. He charges the church with catering more to the rich than to the poor, in order to keep them in good humor and increased contributions. Thinking people perhaps complain not so much about the poor delivery of the sermon, or even the lack of logical construction and continuity, as desirable as these may be, as of *the poverty of thought, the lack of ideas and the absence of inspiration.* Let us not forget that in recent years the standard of education has been raised among the laity through better educational facilities, the easy access to the library, the forums and other agencies including the movies and the radio. While this is a fact, it is also true that not all pastors have kept step with these changed conditions, but have rather stayed on their former level.

Of course in all fairness we must say, that not all complaints which are made can justly be laid to the failure of the ministry and the church. The materially-minded spirit of our age, the mad chase after purely earthly interests and the unwillingness to seek higher, spiritual and abiding values to a goodly extent form the true basis of many charges against the church and her leaders. Nevertheless it is true that many pastors do not keep abreast of the times. They do not read enough and therefore starve themselves and others intellectually and spiritually. The fact that our homes are filled with books and magazines of all kinds, and that important questions are constantly discussed everywhere,—at home, in church, in school, in society, in the shop, in the office, even in the Pullman Car, is a challenge to every preacher to read, and *read* and READ. This happened to me recently. After Easter I conducted in my church a "Pentecost Study Class," meeting on Wednesday evenings. A feature was a free-for-all discussion. In one of these discussions a member of the class remarked that he had just returned from the south and that his Pullman was almost filled with preachers, enroute to a church convention. The chief topic of their conversation was "the gospel of humanism"

and one of the preachers asked him what he thought about it. He said that he had not heard much about it and so he asked my opinion. Fortunately not long before I had read a splendid article on this new cult from the pen of Dr. Edgar Sheffeld Brightman of the Boston University, and so was fairly able to give an account.

Another thing which I consider of the greatest importance, second to none is

The Preparation of the Sunday Sermon.

When do you begin to study your sermon, as we usually say? Have you a systematic course of texts connected by a continuous thought? Or do you choose your texts at random, in a haphazard, happy-go-lucky way, depending on the mood in which you happen to find yourself sometime on Saturday? To a noted English lawyer, Lord Bowen, is attributed the statement "Cases are won in chambers," meaning that the root of his success is not in the court-room but in his office. He will not depend on a triumph by extemporaneous wit and chance, but by the most careful and critical preparation, by hard work in his office. "The sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light." Luke 16: 8. If this barrister wins his case before he meets the jury by the victorious strength of his preparations, shall it be otherwise with the preacher before he faces his congregation on Sunday morning? *We too must "win our cases in chambers!"* Only a genius can influence others by extemporized efforts. But most of us are not in this class. Mere talkativeness will interest no one. We quote again from Dr. Jowett: "Happy-go-lucky sermons will lay no necessity upon the reason nor put any strong constraint to the heart. Preaching that costs nothing accomplishes nothing. If the study is a lounge the pulpit will be an impertinence." We cannot therefore stress too much the need and the expediency of the most careful preparation of the sermon.

Having done our duty faithfully in the study, we are ready to meet God and our people in

The Pulpit

"There is no sphere of labor more endowed with holy privilege and sacred promise," says Dr. Jowett, "and there is no sphere where a man's impoverishment can be so painfully obtrusive," as the pulpit. "The pulpit may be the center of overwhelming power, and it may be the scene of tragic disaster." Who of us has not at one time or another felt the truth and the weight of this statement? What is preaching? WHY do we preach? *It is the distinct activity of leading men and women to Christ, out of their weariness and struggles, their doubts, temptations and sins,* to

find peace for their souls in him who alone can say "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." *To reach that aim is our glory, to fail in it is our shame.* James closed his epistle with these words: "My brethren, if any among you err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins."

Keeping this goal in mind it will help the preacher to escape many

Perils of the Pulpit

He will not be tempted to give a mere exhibition of his ability. It will keep him from ostentatious display of any kind. He will have power, but he will not be boisterous. He will shed light and kindle fires from the altar of the Lord. He will warm the hearts and cheer the souls. Dr. Vollmer often used to tell this story, When a scientist said to a church deacon "We are searching now for a way to produce light without heat," the deacon replied "O, we have that. Come around next Sunday and hear our new preacher. He has just graduated from Harvard." Oratorical fireworks and flashlight shots, trivialities and commonplace slang adventures and cheap vaudeville jokes may amuse some of the people some of the time, but *they can never replace the quiet, deep going, earnest appeal to the best in man to seek companionship with God.*

The sense of our high calling will prevent the minister from *riding his hobby in the pulpit.* Perhaps we all have a hobby, a topic or theme or pet idea which constantly occupies our mind and which rears and kicks in season and out of season. I have known pastors who have used practically the same sermon everywhere for years, whenever they were invited to preach outside of their own church. I say nothing against your hobby. It is a poor man who has no taste for anything in particular or special. But I say that a hobby always runs in one direction only and that makes one dull and onesided and is apt to turn the most brilliant mind into a bore and into a spiritual and intellectual pauper. We are to present not one side of the christian way only, however it may appeal to us personally, but we must offer to the congregation the entire plan of God concerning man's salvation. The hobby which many ride in our days with more or less skill is the socalled *"Social Gospel."* Truly, christianity *is* activity in a social sense. The great law "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is one of the fundamental requirements in the followers of Jesus Christ. "Faith, if it have not works is dead in itself." James 2: 17. Jesus Christ, our Lord, himself is the best exponent of social christianity. His

Sermon on the Mount offers the fundamental laws for a solution of most of our problems. This we believe and this we must preach.

But Jesus Christ is more than merely an interpreter of social righteousness, much more. *Social righteousness,* the correction and abolishing of the many ills of mankind, *is to him the reflection, the inevitable result of inward spiritual partnership and harmony with God.* Matthew 12: 50; Matthew 23: 14, 23, 25. His miracles, these wonderful works through which he rendered social service even to the most wretched ones of his people, were never an end and aim in themselves. Invariably they were a challenge to seek higher things, spiritual values, abiding works. Because he insisted on this he refused to give a sign when unbelief demanded it, or to make an exhibition of his power, when Herod was desirous to see some miracle done by him. For his insistence on spiritual righteousness rather than social righteousness they crucified him. So we say it is wrong to stress continually the emphasis of the social principles of Jesus to the exclusion of his spiritual demands. Professor Rauschenbusch, Dr. Vollmer, Dr. Kamphausen and other experts along these lines warn repeatedly and emphatically to fall into such onesided practise.

Another hobby just now is *Pacifism.* I believe in universal peace. I believe that the glorious visions of Isaiah and Micah shall be realized some day. The time will come when the nations of the earth shall learn war no more and when there shall be peace on earth. I believe these things and preach them, because "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken them." But they will not come as speedily as some seem to hope and expect. They will certainly not come over night. I think that in our days we are making progress towards a warless world, towards universal peace. The atmosphere seems to be clearing. Public opinion to a marked degree has been changed favorably and the dawn of a new day may be seen dimly by such as have eyes to see. *But no impatience of man will hasten the rising of the full and undisturbed glory of the Lord, the Prince of Peace.* So while we preach "universal peace," let us not do this one thing and forget other things of equal or greater importance.

Prohibition is the hobby which is ridden to death in many pulpits, especially in those of what we are accustomed to call "American churches." Very recently I attended a Methodist church. The preacher had previously announced as his text Matthew 16: 19 "I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven." This attracted me. Of exegesis there was little or nothing in this sermon. The salient point of the text was missed entirely, but a high light was the denunciation of the *Literary Digest* Poll on

Prohibition held recently. I shall say nothing further on this subject, for I fear to cite a spirit which afterwards may be hard to banish.

Keeping the purpose of preaching, the saving of souls, in mind, the living witness of Jesus Christ will never omit *the evangelistic element* in his sermons. Our faith is not an accidental haphazard acquisition of vague uncertain facts or theories, moral platitudes, and pious cant, but it is the firm confidence and trust in God in which man accepts and retains Jesus Christ, crucified and risen from the dead, as his personal and only saviour and redeemer. Our faith rests on direct divine revelations and our sermons must be a witness to these. Unless the pastor is personally convinced of the saving grace of the Gospel and able to say sincerely "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," what excuse has he to occupy an evangelical pulpit? E. Stanley Jones says: "The philosophers may enlighten me, the moralists may instruct me, the prophets may inspire me, but my need is deeper. I need a SAVIOUR. For I am deeply hurt,—sinhurt. So after the best men have spoken their advice, and even after the BEST MAN has taught and shown me by his example how to live, I know that my need is not yet met, its depth has not yet been reached. I find myself gazing on a cross and my lips are framing the healing words

"When I survey the wondrous cross
On which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss
And pour contempt on all my pride."

There are other perils of the pulpit, but let these suffice. *If you will make your audience feel that you are filled with life, with spirit, with fire, with a holy passion for souls, the joy of the ministry will be yours.*

A preacher does not cease to be a preacher when the church doors close behind him on Sunday. His mission does not change when he enters

The Homes of His Members

during the week. The sphere and the mode of his activity is different, but his business is the same. Whether in the pulpit or on the street car or on a visit he is the representative of the church, the ambassador of Jesus Christ, the messenger of peace.

To most pastors, especially to young ministers, the regular systematic pastoral calls seem to represent perhaps the least desirable activity of the ministerial profession. If you have read the "Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic" you will re-

member how Reinhold Niebuhr, this keen and critical observer of humanity felt, when he made his first pastoral calls in homes and at sickbeds. With eighteen families in his Mission Church, he tells us, it took him six weeks and he had not seen all of them in that time. "Usually I walk past a house two or three times before I summon the courage to go in," he says. "I am always very courteously received, so I don't know exactly why I should not be able to overcome this curious timidity. Usually after I have made a call I find some good excuse to quit for the afternoon." Later on, in 1919, he writes "Here I make one visit (in a hospital) in an afternoon and get all done up."

Perhaps we all could tell of similar experiences. This timidity, I take it, has been in most of us at a certain period of our ministry. There was, to begin with, the lack of experience, or an inborn natural backwardness, a shy and sensitive reserve, the timidity of untried powers, or the deference and respect which a young man pays to a maturer mind or to more advanced years, all these and similar feelings may have had a tendency to check our good intentions and place a restraint on our recognized duties.

Even experienced pastors find it difficult to exercise the duty of what in German we call so appropriately "Seelsorge," the shepherding of the individual soul. Dr. Jowett speaks of what he terms a "certain secularity, often imbedded in our characters," and in which we shrink from speaking on religion in the private home. We talk about business, politics, sport and what not, but religion is often untouched and our most solemn commission is being neglected. Some pastors are "good mixers" but poor shepherds.

We also feel sometimes a certain reluctance which gives us a false sense of assuming possibly an air of moral and spiritual superiority. This kind of a fear however, it seems to me, should not be too difficult to overcome, for most people expect their minister to be on a higher moral and spiritual level than their own and they look to him for advise and guidance.

Sometimes pastoral visits are apt to test our courage. Dr. Jowett tells of an interesting experience which we perhaps could duplicate times and again. "I vividly remember the first battle-royal I had soon after my ministry began. I heard that one of my people was "giving way to drink." He was a man of standing in the church and he was possessed of considerable wealth. I had already preached more than one temperance sermon, but these had been general messages addressed to a congregation. I was now ordered by the Master to carry the message to an individual, and to tactfully withstand to his face, because he stood condemned. How I wriggled under the commission! How I shrank from it!

How I dallied with it! And even when I had fought my way almost to his door, I lingered in the street in faithless loitering. But at length courage conquered fear. I faced my man. Tremblingly I gave him my message, and by the grace of God he heard the voice of God and was saved from a horrible pit and the miry clay. Gentlemen, it seemed as though I could preach a sermon and never meet a devil: but as soon as I began to take my sermon to the individual the streets were thick with devils."

You and I no doubt have fought similar battles. They do not always end in a marked victory. Twice during my ministry a similar occasion brought about a change in the pastorate. But, brethren, I want to say, *your faith and your courage remain, after the smoke of the battle has cleared away.*

Perhaps the most trying experiences are cases of an exceptionally sad nature, when we are expected to administer the consolations of the Word of God, and feel keenly our own weakness and helplessness. Never did I learn to understand better what our Lord meant when He said after the woman with an issue of blood had secretly touched his garment. "Who is it that touched me, for I perceived that power had gone from me," (Luke 8: 45, 46) until one day I was called to attend in an unusually sad affliction which had come to one of my families. I actually did feel how strength had gone out of me. I was not only mentally but physically fatigued after that experience.

But this is only one side of the story. The most blessed adventures came to me at sickbeds, in funeral houses, in homes of tribulations. *It is my firm conviction that nothing binds the hearts of pastors and church members, I mean the sincere ones, more closely together in love than the faithful ministry of comforting and intercession. More hearts are opened, more confidence is won, more heroes and heroines of faith and patience are discovered, more gratitude is found, when we meet life in its afflictions and helplessness than at any other time.* I had a friend in the ministry who was perhaps the poorest excuse of a pulpit speaker that I ever have known. But he built up a large city church and served it for more than a generation until the Lord called him to the higher life. He was a weak preacher but a most excellent Seelsorger. That was the secret of his marked success.

I must come to a close. I fear to bore you if I continue much longer. I have said some things which originally I had not intended to say and I have omitted things which I had planned to stress. Much more than I have said could and should be presented. But the subject is entirely too big and manysided for a conference paper. Besides the time which was allotted me was very brief.

Perhaps I have spoken too much out of my own experience. Many of you could have said the same things in a better, more forceful way. But if in this presentation I have succeeded to touch familiar chords and to revive both painful and blessed recollections and, experiences, or if I, in all modesty I say it, have encouraged and helped one or the other, I feel amply rewarded for the expenditure of time and humble effort which this paper demanded of me. For your indulgence in which you have followed me thus far, I am grateful.

Brethren, our calling is a holy one. Our task is not easy. But our Lord is mighty and kind and patient, and great is the reward of his good and faithful servant. The joy of the Lord shall be his portion forever!

CAN WE STILL LEARN FROM THE JEW?

Karl M. Chworowsky, Elmhurst, Ill.

One of the most hopeful signs of a coming better day is the open and frank fraternising between religious and racial groups that for centuries have been separated and kept apart by prejudice, mutual distrust, and dislike based upon ignorance or only partial information. Not so long ago a public meeting of leaders in the world of Catholicism and Protestantism would have aroused spirited comment, and a gathering of representatives of Christendom and Judaism for the consideration of questions of common interest would have shocked our communities. Today Catholic, Protestant, and Jew meet openly, in the full light of publicity, and about their deliberations there prevails an atmosphere of frankness, their fellowship is encouraged by a mutual respect and understanding that augurs well for the realization of mankind's most daring dreams.

The hope for a humanity united in purpose and aspiration must rest primarily upon a progressive achievement of mutual appreciation between races, nations, and religions, and any attempt of the past to bring men together, whether into political leagues, or economic alliances, or religious fraternities, has clearly demonstrated that any such association is possible only on the foundation of appreciation, upon which can be built the structure of mutual respect, understanding, and co-operation. Nowhere has it been more difficult to achieve such appreciation and therewith a closer fellowship than in the religious realm. It is one of the great paradoxes of history that the one interest of the race which by all logic of the spirit should unite men has more than any other influence divided and estranged them.

Only recently there was held in St. Louis a conference of leaders in religious education representing Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. It was in many respects a remarkable convention; not that it gave rise to any romantic optimism as to the ease with which a united front might be established by these three distinctive groups against the common foes, moral obscurantism and spiritual illiteracy, but the deliberations and debates disclosed that in spite of the frank recognition of far-reaching differences and deep-seated peculiarities the conviction was gaining that a modus operandi might be found and some sort of unity might be created to further the high purposes of religious education. The St. Louis conference like other previous conferences may claim a distinct merit in blazing, if only a little farther, the trail through the underbrush of ancient and out-worn prejudices and intolerances towards the

high-way of effective co-operation between America's leading religious groups.

We now know for a certainty that it is possible for Catholic and Protestant to get together for deliberation and for co-operative effort; and this is possible only because both Catholic and Protestant are being steadily disillusioned as regards their ancient mis-understandings that for centuries have raised walls of hostility and ill-will between them. And we know with equal certainty that now Christian and Jew can get together on the same basis, for again here the contacts of mutual interest are many and vital.

Those of us who have not been afraid to face the stark realities involved in these experiments of a finer relationship between groups of traditionally opposed creeds and religions, know how much has already been done in awakening among the ancient divisions of Christendom a more cordial appreciation of the excellencies and virtues abiding in the other group. To achieve the same understanding, however, among Christian and Jew has been a task of much greater difficulty. Into this relationship there has entered as the deposit of almost twenty centuries so much bitterness, so much of superstition, bigotry, and ill-feeling that it must be a matter of great joy to any humane spirit that the actual rapprochement between Jew and Non-Jew has proceeded as far as is now apparent. It has been terribly hard for the Christian to realize that he is a debtor both to "the Gentile *and* to the Jew," and it has been even harder for him to recognize the extent of his huge indebtedness to Judaism.

And yet, what should be easier for the follower of Jesus Christ than to acknowledge this debt? The Jew has been our teacher ever since the days of the Master, who, himself a Jew, passed on to us the Jewish genius of faith and morality, of hope and salvation that inspires the pages of the Old Testament, glorifies the books of the New and speaks to us through all that is abiding and worth while in Christian principle and doctrine. May it not be said without exaggeration, that the soul of Christianity, stripped of its theological trappings is the soul of Judaism? Were they not all Jews, the authors (with possibly one exception) of our sacred writings? Were they not Jews, who first laid down their lives to glorify him, every fibre of whose personality and soul vibrated to Jewish tradition and Jewish spirit? If these statements seem unduly romantic and overly emphatic, may we not be pardoned for once in erring on the side of love and esteem, when for centuries we have so readily indulged the extremes of uncharitableness and hostility?

The writer was deeply moved to think himself anew through the question of our obligation to Judaism when last September he attended a meeting of Chicago Jews held for the purpose of protesting against the recent outrages against Jewish citizens in Jerusalem. I had hoped that sometime and somewhere the voice of the church might be raised in protest against the latest outrage against a people which was daring to enjoy the modest fulfillment of an ancient dream, but my hopes were vain. And it was this meeting which prompted the question leading off this article, "Can we still learn from the Jew?"

This meeting in the Chicago auditorium was in every way a remarkable one. Every seat of the huge hall was filled with earnest men and women; prominent leaders of the race from Chicago and other metropoles of America as well as representatives of European and Palestinian Jewry were among the speakers, but most marvelous of all was the spirit of the audience and the tenor of the orations and resolutions.

There were none of the usual frills and trimmings that commonly go with such public meetings; no singing of sentimental songs, no music, no flare of introductions, nothing but the serious business of speaking out against a wrong, a wrong as old as the race, a wrong in this case perpetrated under conditions that grossly aggravated the crime and painted more hideous its brutality and injury.

I heard here in the course of six speeches, three in Yiddish and three in English, some of the most marvelous oratory it has been my privilege to listen to. The speakers rose to sublime heights of dramatic power and emotional intensity, but at no time, not once during all this outpouring of the Jewish soul in fervor and devotion, in accusation and reproach, was there a hint of the thought of vengeance; not once did any-one even remotely suggest that the thing to do might be to appeal to the military power of the civilized world, to resort to violence, or to demand retribution at the point of the sword. Here men of Jewish blood, speaking to men and women of their race, recalling in connection with the latest Palestinian massacre the two-thousand years of persecution, of oppression, of disenfranchisement and of pogroms spoke for justice, yes, but not for justice by force, for protection, yes, but not for protection by police-power but rather for justice and protection by the spirit of fellowship and love, of forgiveness and understanding.

From the opening words of Judge Harry Fischer of the Chicago court, stating the purpose of the meeting and relating without elaboration and comment the tragic events of the past weeks, through the fiery oratory of Dr. David Rebelsky, leader of the

Palestine labor groups, to the climax in the Demosthenic eloquence of Dr. Solomon Goldman, now rabbi of Temple Anshe Emes in Chicago, the program was dominated by a spirit of restraint, dignity, and self-control that seemed almost superhuman. There were no pleas for punitive expeditions, no demands for reparation and retaliation, no clamor for "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," (a quotation so frequently employed by Christian polemics to prove that Jewish morality is inferior to ours); indeed, the sense of injury and outrage was evident throughout every argument and appeal of the speakers; how could there be a blinking of such obvious facts, of so plain a violation of the principles of civilization and democracy. The condemnation of British negligence rang out clearly and convincingly, and the demands that the rights of the Jewish minority be protected by all safe-guards of enlightened statesmanship and righteous government were formulated with unmistakable directness and persuasive logic, but at no time did the spokesmen of an outraged people resort to cheap emotional clap-trap, there was no jingoistic flag-waving, no call to arms for the defense of "our rights and property."

And as I listened, spellbound and profoundly moved, the glory of the moment came upon me, and I could not but feel deeply and intensely that "Israel is still our teacher." The lesson that Christ has asked us to teach an un-Christian world, the great lesson of forgiveness, of suffering rather than doing injury, of retaliating with love and sympathy where injustice and cruelty mock and hurt, this lesson, it seemed to me, Israel has been teaching an unwilling world for centuries.

Was a penitent mood consistent with such thoughts? I remembered the almost twenty centuries of socalled Christian civilization; centuries during which bloody wars convulsed the continents, centuries of oppression and tyranny imposed by Christian rulers and nations upon subject and weaker races and peoples; I recalled those lurid pages of "Christian History" written by inquisition and persecution, I saw the squalid Ghetto, the streams of refugees seeking escape from bigotry and anti-semitic violence; I heard ringing in my ears the words of Calvary "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" and remembered that the followers of him who spoke these words in the agony of his heart had cursed the "Christ-killers," had sought vengeance, had rendered evil for evil, had hated their enemies, and had filled the world by stupid policies of retaliation and by inhuman measures of economic and social ostracism with reproach against the name of religion and with hatred of His name who taught us none of these things.

"Can this be true?" I caught myself thinking, "Christianity has become the advocate of war and armed force, of oppression and military power, and here Judaism, long denounced as backward in ethical insight and weak in moral inspiration, is giving to the entire civilized world an example of self-control, of spiritual discipline, of dignity and poise in the presence of injustice and wrong, of forgiveness and charity such as the world has rarely ever witnessed on the part of any people?"

I want to be fair and admit that not all Jews of the world, whether Zionists or non-Zionists, not even all the Jews of Chicago, share the temper of this spirit. They are as human as we are, and it is self-evident that in the first reaction to the reports from Palestine Jewish members of the American Legion and Jewish war-veterans everywhere should offer themselves for service in a punitive campaign against the Palestinian Arabs. But these are the rare voices, and that they were not heard at this meeting and have aroused little sympathy and no action among world-Jewry speaks volumes for the moral quality of modern Judaism.

I am quoting this paragraph from the opening speech of the chairman of the Chicago meeting, Judge H. Fischer: "This is our answer to the Arab fanatic; All your brutality and all your barbarism will not weaken our determination to rebuild Palestine as the homeland of the Jews. It has placed upon the Jews a new task which we cheerfully assume. It is to carry enlightenment and civilization into your very midst. You may fight with the dagger, knife, and bullet. We shall come with enlightenment and civilization.

We will help you to a higher standard of living. Though you murdered our innocent children, our hospitals still shall be open for the care of your children. Though you tortured and slaughtered our old, our nurses shall still visit your homes and teach your mothers how to care for your little ones so that they may grow to healthy manhood and womanhood."

Is there anything vindictive, arrogant, spiteful, or base about such sentiments? Can human tolerance go much further? Can the spirit of restraint and forgiveness speak more sublimely? Surely the reporter who referred to "the only militant note" of the meeting in the speech of Dr. Rebelsky when this speaker mentioned the "Maccabean spirit" strained his point.

I tried during this experience and afterwards to imagine a similar meeting of citizens of any Christian country for a similar purpose. I could not help but remember the slogan of America during the Spanish-American war, "Remember the Maine"; I was carried back by memory to the sinking of the Lusitania and its effect upon the war-spirit in our land; I remembered how easily

America, Christian America, was inflamed by the insult to our national dignity and honor in the Mexican disorders of 1916, and how I might heap the record of incidents where the citizens of Christian nations gathered in public protest-meetings and called for the power of the army and navy to protect "our rights and honor" abroad, whether the occasion for protest was the killing of an oil-speculator or the murder of a missionary. I caught myself saying: "Match this protest-meeting of Jewish citizens with any similar meeting of Christian citizens, and tell me whether we may still learn from the Jew."

And it may be well for us to recognize in this connection that the Jew, who is so apt to learn from his Christian environment, might well have adopted another tone and attitude in these protest-meetings which were held the world over. The childish imaginings of a Henry Ford in "The International Jew" have long been disproved as groundless and unreasonable, but we may as well appreciate the fact that the Jew today plays a prominent figure in world finance and politics; how easy it would have been for the leaders of European and American Jewry to make their appeal to the lower instincts of nationalism; how easily they might have used their wealth and prestige to influence popular, and not only Jewish, opinion in favor of military measures; how readily they might have found the ears of governments and politicians, and in this they would have followed the logic and pattern of their Christian fellow-citizens the world over.

In this instance, however, and this is not the only case on record, the Jew, true to his finest traditions, has again refused to use his resources of material wealth and his moral prestige in the civilized world for the purposes of destruction, retaliation, and war, and has preferred to retain his position of leadership on the road of peace, charity, and human brotherhood.

The action of world-Jewry in this latest Palestinian crisis constitutes a powerful challenge to the Christian conscience. We dare not let it pass unheeded, or shall it be said that the sons of Moses are still leading the disciples of Christ?

Buddhismus und Christentum.

Von Professor Dr. Grützmacher, Wiesbaden.

Neben den Christentum können in der Gegenwart nur zwei Religionen den Anspruch erheben Weltreligion zu sein: der Mohammedanismus und der Buddhismus. Diese beiden allein sind ernsthafte Konkurrenten des Christentums in der Welt des Heidentums und im begrenzteren, wenn auch zunehmenden Maß innerhalb der europäisch-amerikanischen Kultur. Mit ihnen bedarf es einer geistigen Auseinandersetzung. Der **Buddhismus**, um den es sich hier handelt, ist allerdings nicht identisch mit jener Religionsform wie sie im Tibet, der Mongolei, der Mandschurei, China, Annam, Korea und Japan in weiten Volkskreisen herrscht und deren Bekenner eine neuere Statistik auf 500,000,000 Bekenner angibt — gegen nur 310,000,000 Christen. Denn mit Recht sagt ein Kenner, Pischel: „Ganz sicher ist die Schätzung nicht, da namentlich für China und Tibet die Angaben unsicher sind" — und er fügt die noch wichtigere Feststellung hinzu: „Der Buddhismus ist überall auf die Volksreligion aufgepropft, die in ihrem Wesen grundverschieden von ihm waren. Nirgends hat der Buddhismus diese Religionen ausrotten können, ja nicht einmal wollen." In China und Japan ist der Buddhismus nur **eine** Religionsform neben andern, neben dem Konfuzianismus, Taoismus, Schintoismus, und zwar ist der Buddhismus für den Einzelnen wesentlich die religiöse Haltung, zu der er sich beim Nahen des Todes und hinsichtlich seiner Hoffnungen auf das Jenseits bekennt — im schärfsten Gegensatz zu der reinen Diesseitigkeit des echten alten Buddhismus. **Der Buddhismus als Volksreligion ist eine polytheistisch-animistische Religionsform, die selbst keinerlei Ansprüche auf missionarische Verbreitung erhebt und noch weniger auf die gebildeten Kreise der westlichen Kultur irgendeine Anziehung ausübt.** Neuerdings machen sich jedoch gerade auch im östlichen Buddhismus Reformbestrebungen geltend, die in einem großen Kongresse der Buddhisten des fernen Ostens 1925 in Tokio zum Ausdruck kamen. Hier beschloß man auch die Missionierung der Welt. Der Buddhismus, den man der Welt darbieten will, ist wesentlich der **alte Buddhismus**, wie er noch heute in Mönchskreisen von Ceilon und Japan, in einzelnen Provinzen des vorderindischen Festlandes, in Birma und Siam vertreten wird. Dieser Buddhismus sucht durch Errichtung theologischer Schulen in Ceilon den Buddhismus der Urzeit wieder lebendig zu machen und ihn auch nach Europa und Amerika zu übertragen. Seit Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts haben sich gerade in **Deutschland** eine Reihe von buddhistischen Vereinigungen mit entsprechenden Zeitschriften gebildet, um auch Europäer für den Bud-

dhismus zu gewinnen. In der Nähe von Berlin existiert ein buddhistisches Haus, das von einem Arzt ins Leben gerufen wurde, in dem regelmäßige buddhistische Versammlungen stattfinden und Einzelnen auch die Möglichkeit gegeben werden soll in buddhistischer Zurückgezogenheit zu leben. Umgekehrt sind einzelne Deutsche nach Ceilon ausgewandert und dort im vollen Sinn in die buddhistische Ordensgemeinde eingetreten. Noch energischer scheint die buddhistische Propaganda in **Amerika** einzusetzen, worüber der entsprechende Artikel in der zweiten Auflage des großen Werkes „Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart" und regelmäßige Notizen in der Zeitschrift „Für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft" berichten. Danach hatte die japanische Schingensekte bereits 1921 in Kalifornien 4, die Schinsekte in Amerika und Kanada 31 buddhistische Missionare. Mit besonderm Erfolg soll der Buddhismus in San Francisco gearbeitet haben. Viel bedeutsamer aber als diese bisher doch außerordentlich begrenzte Gewinnung durch Uebertritt zu dem Buddhismus ist die **geistige Beeinflussung des westlichen Geisteslebens durch buddhistische Gedankengänge.** Am stärksten hat im ersten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts der Philosoph Schopenhauer, in dessen Arbeitszimmer stets eine Buddhastatue stand, die Gedankengänge des Buddhismus mit seiner pessimistischen Philosophie verbunden. Für die weitesten Kreise wurden diese wirksam durch **Richard Wagner,** der besonders im „Ring" und im „Tristan" buddhistische Urerlebnisse und Ziele in eindrucksvollste Worte und Töne zu kleiden vermochte. Andre Denker, wie Eduard von Hartmann und neuerdings Leopold Ziegler haben den Buddhismus wenigstens als notwendige Ergänzung abendländischer Religiosität für die Zukunft angesehen. Erst recht sind in den anthroposophischen und theosophischen Bewegungen buddhistische Geisteselemente eingeschmolzen.

Bei dieser Sachlage erwächst der christlichen Apologetik und Mission die Pflicht einer genauen Bekanntschaft und einer inneren Auseinandersetzung mit dem Buddhismus. Dazu gehört erstens **eine genaue Kenntnis des wirklichen alten Buddhismus, der in der Persönlichkeit Buddhas sich konzentriert und zweitens eine Herausarbeitung der prinzipiellen Gegensätze zwischen dem Buddhismus und dem Christentum, wie es in der Person Jesu erschienen ist.**

I.

Eine zeitlang hat man ähnlich wie fast alle großen Männer der Geschichte auch Buddha für eine reine sagenhafte Figur zu erklären versucht. Aber eine genauere Forschung, besonders europäischer Gelehrter, wie etwa Oldenberg, Pischel und neuerdings besonders Winternitz läßt über die historische Existenz Buddhas und die Grundzüge seines Wesens und seiner Lehre keinen Zweifel aufkommen. Sie zeigt allerdings auch deutlich, wie sein Bild mehr und mehr

von sagenhaften Zügen umgestaltet wird. Infolgedessen ist es notwendig sich sowohl eine Vorstellung von dem geschichtlichen Buddha wie von den Hauptzügen der Legende über ihn zu machen, da man gerade in der letzteren Berührungen und Abhängigkeiten des Christentums vom Buddhismus hat entdecken wollen. **Die ältesten Quellen** des Buddhismus sind wohl etwa hundert Jahre nach dem Tod des Buddha, das heißt rund um das Jahr 380 vor Christus aufgezeichnet worden. Es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, ja sogar wahrscheinlich, daß wir in einzelnen Bestandteilen die Stimme des Buddha selbst wie in der Predigt über die vier heiligen Wahrheiten vernehmen. In diesen ältesten Werken tritt das Biographische und Metaphysische bei Buddha stark zurück. Man vergleicht ihren Inhalt am besten mit der sogenannten Redenquelle des Evangeliums Matthäus. In diesen ältesten Texten erscheint Buddha wesentlich als Mensch, wenn sich auch einige Ansätze zu seiner metaphysischen Umgestaltung nicht übersehen lassen. Diese kommt dann zur vollen Auswirkung unter Heranziehung zahlreicher allgemeiner Legendenstoffe in einer Reihe von Schriften, die wohl in der Zeit kurz vor oder nach Christus erstmalig niedergeschrieben werden. Unter ihnen hat besonders für uns eine Bedeutung das **Lalita Vistara,** da sich hier eine legendenhafte Biographie Buddhas und zwar besonders seiner Jugend dargeboten findet, in der die hauptsächlichsten Erzählungen stehen, in denen man Analogien mit christlichen Vorstellungen gefunden hat.

Als **geschichtliches Buddhabild** ergibt sich etwa das Folgende: Buddhas Leben hat sich wahrscheinlich über die Jahre 560 bis 480 vor Christus hingezogen, da er das Alter von 80 Jahren erreicht hat und sein Tod 100 Jahre vor einem sicher datierbaren südbuddhistischen Konzil stattgefunden hat. Geboren ist er in der Stadt Capilavasto in dem nordindischen Reich Nepal und zwar als der Sohn eines vornehmen, ritterlichen, sich einer gewissen Herrschaft über die Stadt erfreuenden Geschlechts der Scharkja. Sein eigentlicher Name war Siddharta. Seine Mutter scheint bald nach seiner Geburt gestorben zu sein. Seine Jugend war die eines vornehmen Adligen, der alle Freuden des Lebens genoß. Er selbst soll diese Zeit später seinen Jüngern mit den Worten geschildert haben: „Ich wuchs auf unter sorgfältigster Pflege. In meinem väterlichen Heim hatte man für mich allein Lotosteiche mit blauen, weißen und roten Lotosblumen anlegen lassen. Ich gebrauchte nur die feinsten Salben aus Benares." Früh schloß Buddha eine glückliche ebenbürtige Ehe, der ein wohlgeratener Sohn entsproß. Plötzlich aber um sein dreißigstes Lebensjahr befriedigte ihn dieses weltliche Genußleben nicht mehr und er wurde — wie viele Inder vor ihm Mönch —, ging aus dem Hause in die Heimatlosigkeit

und kasteite sich auf das Strengste. Aber auch dieser Wege härtester Askese befriedigte ihn nicht und gab seiner Seele keine Ruhe. Er gab das Mönchsleben darum wieder auf und versenkte sich in strenger Meditation, in sein eignes Innere und erkannte hier die vier heiligen Wahrheiten, die der Grundgehalt seiner Lehre wurden, und von denen im folgenden noch genauer zu reden sein wird. Trotz abmahnender Stimmen in seinem Inneren fand er sich veranlaßt, diese Erkenntnisse allen zugänglich zu machen: „Geöffnet sei allen die Pforte des Heils. Wer Ohren hat, höre die Lehre und lebe ihr nach." Er sucht und findet jetzt eine Reihe von Jüngern, von denen einige ihn dauernd begleiteten, unter ihnen ein Lieblingsjünger Ananda und ein andrer, der mehr und mehr zu seinem Gegner wird, Devadotta. Aber auch weiteren Kreisen, darunter wohl auch seinen eigenen Verwandten, verkündet er seine Lehre. In ewig gleicher Form führte er dieses Leben eines Lehrers 45 Jahre lang auf steter Wanderschaft. Seine große Energie erhielt ihn am Leben bis in das 80. Lebensjahr. In ihm trat er in den Mangohain zu Kusinagara. Dort starb er unter freiem Himmel, allein im Kreis seiner Jünger. Er tröstete diese mit verschiedenen Worten, von denen wohl die folgenden auf wesentliche Echtheit Anspruch erheben können: „Es könnte Euch vielleicht der Gedanke kommen: Dahin ist die Unterweisung des Meisters, wir haben keinen Meister mehr. Aber so dürft Ihr die Sache nicht ansehen. Die Lehre und die Satzung, die ich Euch gewiesen und vorgezeichnet habe, die sind Eure Meister nach meinem Ende." Seine letzten Worte waren wohl: „Vergänglich ist alle Erscheinung, strebet unermüdet."

Dieses schlichte Bild eines menschlichen Lehrers, der in einem Jüngerkreis eine feste Gemeinde fand, ist von der Legende ausgestaltet. Nach ihr lebte der Buddha schon in einer jenseitigen Präexistenz und beschloß auf die Bitten der Götter in einer königlichen Familie menschliche Gestalt zu gewinnen. In der Form eines weißen Elefanten drang ein Gott in die Seite der königlichen Gattin. Heißt es doch in der Legende, die man mit der christlichen Erzählung von der jungfräulichen Geburt Jesu verglichen hat, wörtlich so: „Da kam der Bodhrisatwa, zu einem weißen herrlichen Elefanten geworden, er griff mit dem wie ein Silberband aussehenden Rüssel eine weiße Lotosblume, umwandelte dreimal das Lager der Mutter, klopfte an ihre rechte Seite und war wie in ihren Leib hineingegangen." In einem heiligen Haine vollzieht sich die Geburt; kurz nach ihr stellt sich das Kind auf die Füße und ruft: „Ich bin der Höchste in dieser Welt." Ein alter Büßer kommt und begrüßt das Kind mit den Worten: „Wahrlich dies Kind wird einst ein höchster, vollendeter Buddha werden und den Menschen den

Weg zur Erlösung weisen." Weinend aber erklärt er, selbst diese Zeit nicht mehr erleben zu können. Die Brahmanen weissagen, daß er entweder im weltlichen Leben ein Weltherrscher oder im geistlichen ein Buddha werden würde. Der Vater will ihn im weltlichem Stand erhalten und umgibt ihn mit höchstem Luxus und ermöglicht ihm vor allen Dingen durch ungezählte Frauen neben seiner rechtmäßigen Ehegattin alle sinnlichen Genüsse. Da kam die große Wandlung in seinem Leben. In vier aufeinanderfolgenden Ausfahrten schaut der Prinz zunächst einen Greis, dann einen Kranken, zuletzt eine Toten. Als er hört, daß jeder Mensch einmal alt oder krank wird und zuletzt stirbt, wird ihm alle Freude an seinem bisherigen Luxusleben vergällt und er beschließt, das Leben zu gestalten, wie das eines Mönches, dem er auf der vierten Ausfahrt begegnet. Ohne Abschied verläßt er Weib und Kind. Da folgt ihm der Versucher Mara und spricht zu ihm: „Herr, verlaßt doch Euer Haus nicht, um als Mönch umher zu wandeln. Heute in sieben Tagen wird Euch die Herrschaft über die ganze Erde mit ihren vier Weltteilen und zweitausend Inseln zuteil werden." Der Prinz aber antwortet: „Versucher, ich weiß, daß die Weltherrschaft mir bestimmt ist, aber ich begehre sie nicht, ich will unter dem Zujauchzen der ganzen Welt ein Buddha werden." Er wird es auch, nachdem er das asketische Mönchstum wieder aufgegeben hat durch seine Erleuchtung, bei der ihn böse Geister fortwährend stören und zuletzt der Teufel selbst ihn an der Verkündigung hindern will. Es gelingt Buddha auch seinen Verwandten die Lehre zu bringen, als er in sein königliches Heim als einfacher bettelnder Wanderprediger zurückkehrt. Er tut auch mannigfache Wunder; in einer Stadt hört eine Seuche sofort bei seinem Eintritt auf. Einmal ruft ihm eine edle Jungfrau zu: „Die Mutter, der Vater, die Gattin ist fürwahr selig, die einen Mann wie diesen hat." Einmal lobt er eine Witwe, die ein geringes Opfer bringt. Besonders ausgestaltet hat die Legende seinen Tod. Als er sich von dem Wunsch freimachte zu leben, entstand ein entsetzliches Erdbeben und als er sich ermüdet in dem Hain niedergelegt hat, beginnt sein Antlitz vom himmlischen Glanz überstrahlt zu werden. Er sagt zu seinem Jünger: „Siehe Ananda, an dem Abend, an dem ich ein Buddha wurde, und an dem ich das Nirwana erreiche, habe ich diese Farbe." Die Bäume beginnen zu blühen und Früchte zu tragen und ihn mit Blüten und Früchten zu überschütten. Neben den Abschiedsworten verlangt Buddha von den Seinen, daß sie stetig vier Orte besuchen sollten, die Städte seiner Geburt, die Erlangung der Buddhawürde, der ersten Predigt und seines Todes. Der Scheiterhaufen mit seiner Leiche entzündet sich von selbst, aber es bleiben wunderbarerweise einige Reliquien seiner Körperlichkeit

zu dauernder Verehrung übrig. Von einem individuellen postexistenten Fortleben, aus dem Buddha in diese Welt weiter hineinwirkt und Gegenstand des lebendigen religiösen Verkehrs für seine Gemeinde bleibt, weiß die älteste Legende noch nichts.

II.

Sind dies die Grundzüge des legendarischen und geschichtlichen Bildes Buddhas, so **erhebt sich die Frage, ob irgendwelche geschichtlichen und sachlichen Beziehungen und Aehnlichkeiten zwischen ihnen und der christlichen Ueberlieferung bestehen.** Immer wieder hat man sich in der Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrunderts bemüht, solche Beziehungen zu behaupten. Diejenigen, die da meinen, daß der Buddhismus irgendwie vom Christentum beeinflußt sei, sind in ganz geringer Minderzahl und zwar mit Recht, denn die buddhistischen Erzählungen sind doch zu früh fertig gewesen, wenn auch manche erst in nachchristlicher Zeit schriftlich fixiert wurden, als das sie von der christlichen Ueberlieferung hätten beeinflußt werden können. Aber auch umgekehrt **ist ein exakter Nachweis, daß die christliche Tradition von der Buddhistischen beeinflußt wäre, für die Zeit des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts nicht gelungen.** Der erste christliche Lehrer, der tatsächlich den Buddhismus erwähnt ist Clemens Alexandrinus um 200 nach Christus. Das schließt natürlich nicht aus, daß irgendwelche anonyme Berührungen schon früher etwa durch Reisende aus Indien nach Palästina hätten stattfinden können. Allein auch dafür ist ein Nachweis nicht geliefert. Ein neuerer Gelehrter, Pischel, hat versucht, das Land Turkestan auf Grund neuerer Funde als das Gebiet zu bezeichnen, in dem christliche und buddhistische Ueberlieferungen sich vermischten. Allein, wenn man dieser Behauptung näher nachgeht, so findet man, daß eine solche Berührung erst für das 3. nachchristliche Jahrhundert nachweisbar ist, in welchem syrische Christen in Turkestan Zuflucht fanden. Das aber sind 200 Jahre zu spät, um Einflüsse auf die Evangelienbildung und gerade auch die Vorgeschichten des Evangeliums Lukas und Matthäus anzunehmen, deren Fixierung doch heute selbst von stark kritischer Seite in das erste nachchristliche Jahrhundert verlegt wird. **Infolgedessen haben alle sachkundigen exakten Forscher eine Beeinflussung der neutestamentlichen Literatur durch den Buddhismus als höchst unwahrscheinlich abgelehnt.** So erklärte Oldenberg: „Man hat vor Kurzem gesagt, daß an die Türen des Neuen Testaments Buddha klopft. Gewiß solches Klopfen hört man hier und dort, wenn man die späteren Schriften der altchristlichen Literatur durchforscht. Aber an die Pforten des Neuen Testaments selbst scheint mir Buddha kaum zu klopfen.“ Winternitz sagt: „Es ist nach allem wohl ausgeschlossen, daß die buddhistische Literatur unmittelbaren Einfluß auf die Evangelien geübt hat.“

Kann es sich demnach um keine historischen Abhängigkeiten des Christentums vom Buddhismus handeln, so bleibt nur noch die Frage übrig, ob vielleicht **psychologisch erklärbare religionsgeschichtliche Analogien** in dem Sinn, wie in einem früheren Artikel von ihnen gesprochen wurde, **vorhanden sind.** In der Tat bietet sowohl die buddhistische wie die christliche Ueberlieferung, die Erzählung von einer **Versuchung** durch den Bösen, welcher die Begründer der beiden Religionen von ihrer geistlichen Verkündigung zu Gunsten weltlicher Herrschaft abhalten will. In Bezug auf sie erklärt Pischel mit Recht: „Die beiden Züge, in denen sich die buddhistische und die christliche Erzählung berühren, erklären sich ungezwungen aus der ganz gleichen Lage, in der sich beide Religionsstifter befinden. Das ist so durchaus natürlich und menschlich, daß der Gedanke sich sehr wohl zweimal an verschiedenen Orten unabhängig voneinander entstanden sein kann." Tritt man in die genaue Prüfung der einzelnen für Analogien erklärten Erzählungen ein, so findet man, daß die Verschiedenheiten unendlich viel größer sind, als die ganz allgemeinen Analogien. Wählen wir als Beispiele die oben berichteten buddhistischen Erzählungen über die **Geburt Buddhas** und die **Begrüßung durch einen alten Einsiedler.** Zwar soll auch Buddha wunderbar geboren sein, aber keineswegs jungfräulich, wie man häufig ungenau behauptet hat. Er ist der Sohn einer verehelichten Königin, die allerdings in diesem Fall nicht durch ihren Gatten, sondern durch ein mythologisches Wesen in der Gestalt eines weißen Elefanten schwanger wird, der mit dem Heiligen Geist, der Maria überschattete, nicht das Geringste gemeinsam hat. — Aehnlich steht es mit der Vergleichbarkeit des Besuches Simeon bei Jesu und Asitas bei Buddhas. Simeon freut sich, Asita weint, Simeon erkennt an, daß er die Erfüllung einer Weissagung erlebt, Asita weissagt etwas für die Zukunft, das er nicht mehr erleben wird; Asita macht einen Besuch im Himmel und erfährt dort auf wunderbare Weise die Geburt des Buddha, Simeon trifft ganz natürlich das Kind mit den Eltern in dem Tempel. Als gemeinsame Züge bleiben nur übrig, daß ein Greis einem Kind gegenübertritt und jener über dieses Zukunft seine Gedanken ausspricht. Nimmt man dazu noch den Tatbestand, daß die buddhistischen Erzählungen über die Kindheitsgeschichte des Buddha im Lalita-Vistara ungefähr den vierzigfachen Umfang der Kindheitsgeschichten in unsern Evangelien hat, so würde sich bei einem nebeneinander Drucken beider Texte ergeben, daß auf 39 volle Seiten buddhistischer Texte, erst die 40. Seite auch auf christlicher gefüllt sein würde und das Problem der Analogie in Betracht käme.

Ergeben sich so schon zu der buddhistischen Legende keine historischen Abhängigkeiten und nur ganz allgemeine religionspsycho-

logische Analogien bei weitüberwiegenden Verschiedenheiten, so zeigt erst recht eine Vergleichung zwischen dem Grundwesen des geschichtlichen Buddha und dem Jesu eine totale Differenz, die wir in einigen Hauptzügen nachzuweisen suchen. — Größe und Eigenart eines Menschen hängt zum guten Teil von seiner Entwicklung ab und zwar in der Richtung, ob sie eine gebrochene oder eine einheitliche ist. Die Entwicklung des geschichtlichen Buddha ist eine dreimal gebrochene. Erst lebte er in vollem Genuß und Bejahung des Weltlebens, dann als völlig weltabgewandter Mönch und erst zuletzt fand er seinen eigenen Erlösungsweg. Bei Jesus ist es anders. Von Anfang an lebt er in der natürlichen Gemeinschaft mit seinem himmlischen Vater und herangewachsen wechselt er nicht zwischen Genuß und Weltverachtung, sondern lebt und verkündet in unbeweglicher Stetigkeit das Reich Gottes auf Erden. **Der unsicher wechselnden Buddhagestalt tritt ein Mann gegenüber, der von Anfang an wußte, was er wollte und wollte, was er wußte.** — Zur Vergleichung zweier Menschen ist die Beobachtung bedeutsam, welche der verschiedenen Seelenkräfte die vorherrschende ist, vor allen Dingen ob Intellekt oder Wille der dominierende Faktor ist. Bei Buddha wie den indischen Menschen herrscht fraglos die Erkenntnis und damit die Lehre vor. Buddha ersetzt eine falsche Erkenntnis über Wesen der Welt und Aufgabe des menschlichen Daseins durch die rechte Erkenntnis. **Er ist wesentlich eine rezeptive und damit eine weibliche Natur.** Seine Lebensleistung geht auf in der Verkündigung der rechten Erkenntnis, die er sich auf intellektuellem Weg auf seine Jünger zu übertragen bemüht. Bei Jesus fehlt es selbstverständlich auch nicht an Erkenntnissen und der Mitteilung durch die Predigt. Aber schon bei seiner ersten großen Rede, der Bergrede, haben die Zuhörer weniger den Eindruck, daß ihnen hier neue Erkenntnisse mitgeteilt würden, als daß eine Persönlichkeit zu ihnen rede, „die Gewalt hat." Der gewaltige mächtige Charakter einer Persönlichkeit, in der ein ungeheurer Wille lebt und sich betätigt, bedingt den Eindruck von Jesus. In der Tat ist sein ganzes Leben die Auswirkung eines allmächtigen Willens. Dieser allmächtige Wille unterwirft sich nicht nur die Seelen der Menschen, sondern gestaltet auch ihre Leiblichkeit um und vermag in sich sogar wunderbar die Natur zu unterwerfen. **Jesu Persönlichkeit ist durch und durch männlich aktiv.** Diese Unterscheidung der beiden Gestalten wird auch bei ihrem Ende noch einmal deutlich. Buddha lebt bis in ein hohes Alter und löst dann seine Natur schmerzlos auf. Jesus lebt nur bis zur Höhe seines Mannestums und gibt willentlich sein Dasein in Leid und Tod.

Allein der tiefste Unterschied der beiden Männer und der von ihnen verkündeten Weltanschauung wird erst deutlich, wenn man

auf die **verschiedenen Zwecke ihres Lebens und ihrer Verkündigung achtet.** Buddha lehrt nur eins, nämlich daß diese ganze Welt nur Leiden und nur Elend sei und daß es infolgedessen nur eine Aufgabe gäbe, sich von diesen Leiden und damit von der Welt loszumachen. Buddhas Lehre umfaßt nur die vier heiligen Wahrheiten, deren Wortlaut wir noch heute vernehmen können: „Dies ihr Mönche ist die heilige Wahrheit **vom Leiden:** Geburt ist Leiden, Alter ist Leiden, Krankheit ist Leiden, mit Unlieben vereint sein, von Lieben getrennt sein ist Leiden, nicht Erlangen, was man begehrt ist Leiden. Dies ist heilige Wahrheit von der **Entstehung des Leidens,** der Durst nach Sein, der von Wiedergeburt zu Wiedergeburt führt samt Lust und Begier, der Durst nach Werden, der Durst nach Macht. Dies ist die heilige Wahrheit **von der Aufhebung des Leidens:** Die Aufhebung des Durstes durch gänzliche Vernichtung. Dies ist die heilige Wahrheit von **dem Weg zur Aufhebung des Leidens:** Es ist dieses heilige, achtteilige Recht — rechtes Glauben, Entschließen, Wort, Tat, Leben, Streben, Gedenken, sich Versenken."

Für Buddha ist danach die gesamte Wirklichkeit nur Leid, er ist radikaler Pessimist. Jesus kennt nicht minder das Leid in der Welt, aber übersieht in ihr auch nicht die Schöpfung des Gottes, der seine Sonne in ihr scheinen und auch Lilien auf ihren Feldern wachsen läßt. Für Buddha ist das leidvolle Schicksal in der Welt wesentlich eine **Naturnotwendigkeit,** die sich aus der Kreatürlichkeit des Menschen ergibt. Für Jesus ist das Leid erst eine **Folge der bewußten Abkehr des menschlichen Willens von der Befolgung des göttlichen Willens. Buddha ist kosmisch, Jesus ethisch eingestellt.** Entsprechend dieser Auffassung sieht Buddha konsequent das Ziel in der Aufhebung nicht nur des Leidens, sondern auch des mit ihm identischen Lebens. Bei konsequentem Durchdenken, das Buddha allerdings selbst abgelehnt hat, ergibt sich als sein Endziel die radikale Aufhebung aller individuellen Forteristenz geistiger und leiblicher Art, ja aller kosmischen Wirklichkeit, entsprechend einem buddhistischen Wort: „Aufgelöst ist der Körper, die Vorstellung vernichtet, alle Empfindungen sind vom Feuer verzehrt, aufgehört haben die Betätigungen, das Bewußtsein ist zur Rüste gegangen." **Buddhas Ziel ist der Tod in dem denkbar radikalsten Sinn,** den man diesem Begriff geben kann. Jesus dagegen wollte, daß jeder Mensch seine Seele erhalte und gewinne und sie in dieser und jener Wirklichkeit immer lebendiger mache und sein Ziel ist das Leben des einzelnen Menschen und damit auch irgendeiner, wenn auch veränderlicher kosmischer Wirklichkeit. **Er ist darum des Predigers des Lebens im denkbar stärksten Sinn.**

Zur Erreichung seines Ziels verkündet Buddha neben der meditativen Vertiefung in das eigene Innere auch eine Sittlichkeit, wie sie die vierte heilige Wahrheit näher beschreibt. Diese Sittlichkeit aber hat zum Ziel eine Stillstellung des Willens in der eigenen Persönlichkeit wie bei den Mitmenschen. Am Schluß einer Erzählung, die sogar die Feindesliebe verlangt, steht der charakteristische Satz: „Durch Feindschaft kommt Feindschaft nicht zur Ruhe. Durch Nichtfeindschaft kommt Feindschaft zur Ruhe." Das will besagen, daß gerade die unsittlichen Handlungen den Menschen in die Unruhe dieser Welt verwickeln und von ihm darum unterlassen werden sollen, damit er nicht von dem ruhigen Beschreiten des Erlösungsweges abgezogen werde. **Auch die Betätigung gegenüber den Mitmenschen hat vor allem den Sinn, sich von der Unruhe dieser Welt zu erlösen, bei Jesus dagegen haben alle sittlichen Betätigungen den Zweck, die eigene Persönlichkeit immer stärker und aktiver zu machen und ebenso dem Mitmenschen den Spielraum ihrer Aktivität zu reinigen und zu stärken.**

Der tiefste Unterschied zwischen Buddha und Jesus wird aber deutlich erst durch den Blick auf ihr **Verhalten zum Göttlichen.** Für Buddha gibt es keine objektiv bestehende metaphysische Gottheit, von der sich der Mensch abhängig weißt und an die er sich in seinem religiösen Verkehr wendet. Er ist in dem radikalen Sinn Atheist, daß er nicht einmal die Leugnung Gottes für nötig hält, ja die religiöse Problemstellung überhaupt nicht kennt. Er verweist darum die Menschen nur auf sich selbst: „Seid selbst Eure Leuchter." Wie er den Weg der Selbsterlösung gegangen ist, so erwartet er das auch von seinen Jüngern, denen er nur Lehrer und Vorbild sein will. Umgekehrt ist bei Jesus das eigentliche Grundelement die religiöse Beziehung zu einem als wirklich geglaubten Vater Gott, mit dem er sich in seinem innersten Sein auf das engste verbunden weiß und mit dem er im stetem Verkehr steht. Auf diesen Gott und seine Offenbarung verweist er darum seine Jünger für ihre Erlösung. **So treten sich letztlich Buddhismus und Christentum gegenüber. Eine Erlösungsreligion in dem strengen Sinn,** wie wir früher das Wesen der Religion beschrieben, **und eine rein ethische praktische Lebenslehre mit negativem Endziel.** Zwischen beiden muß der einzelne Mensch wählen. Er kann darum nicht dem Buddhismus und dem Christentum zugleich dienen.

Zum Gottsuchen.

Von T. Kugler.

Ohne vorhandene Gottsucher konnte es keine pfingstliche Erneuerung der Gemeinde und Geburt der Kirche Christi geben. Ohne Gottsuchen gibt es kein Gotterleben, keine geistvermittelte Erneuerung. Ihrem Meister gehorsame Seelen warteten zu Jerusalem auf das Eintreffen seiner Verheißung. Wer in Liebe mein Wort hält, zu dem werden wir kommen und Wohnung bei ihm machen. Zuweilen erfüllt der Allgütige gar seine denkwürdige Zusage: „Ich werde von denen gefunden, die mich nicht gesucht haben."

Als einst Schreiber inmitten des festlichen Aufzugs der Schüler seiner Heimatstadt die Nationalhymne mitsang, vermeint er deutlicher wie sonst jene einzigartige Nähe des Erhabenen, allein Heiligen erlebt zu haben. Das Nichtsehen empfand er nicht als Mangel und erwartete kein Hervortreten des Lichtbekleideten aus dem Vorhang wunderbergender Verborgenheit. Macht aber der Unsichtbare sich derart solchen vernehmbar, die ihn garnicht bewußt gesucht haben, so kann es bei den tiefbeschämten Hochbegnadigten doch nur heißen: O Abgrund der Barmherzigkeit! — Meist werden wir freilich die beseligende göttliche Gnadennähe ernstlich suchen müssen, indem wir die Richtung ganz entschieden heimwärts, nach Oben nehmen. An der Danziger Diele steht auch der in Holz geschnitzte Spruch: Von Oben kommt mir Licht, wenn mir's allhier gebricht. — Dies Oberlicht will uns den Heimweg weisen. „Leben, weben und sind wir" aber schon in Gott, warum sollten wir ihn da erst noch suchen wollen? Weil unsre gewöhnliche Lebensweise den Allgegenwärtigen uns verbirgt, ihn für uns unsichtbar gestaltet.

Manche Forscher aller Art gelangen darum nicht zum Ziel, weil sie das ihnen vergeblich dünkende Bemühen einstellen. Ein Verlangen aber verläßt uns nicht leicht, eben jenes unabweisliche des Gottsuchens; wir sind zu tief davon überzeugt, daß nur der Ewige selbst unser Ziel sein kann. Neben Gottes Selbstbezeugung in Schrift, Gemeinde und Gewissen darf auch dies allgemeine Verlangen als bedeutsames **inneres Zeugnis für Gottes Dasein und die Wirklichkeit seines unsichtbaren Reiches** gelten. In ihm allein ist dann auch jener endliche Ausgleich vollzogen, nach dem unser Gerechtigkeitsgefühl so dringend verlangt und auf den z. B. auch Lukas 16, 25 hindeutet.

Welche Stellung nun etwa Wissenschaft und Philosophie einem ersten Urheber gegenüber einnehmen, ist für unsre Frage von geringerem Belang; da auf jenen Wegen ein Mensch schwerlich zu lebendigem Glauben gelangt, ohne den wir doch nicht Gott fin-

den können. Die jetzt folgenden Ausführungen mögen sich den schlichten Abschnitten angliedern: 1. Gott verlieren; 2. Ihn suchen; 3. Ihn finden.

1. Unser Gottsuchen setzt voraus, daß wir jenes fried- und freudvolle Glück schmerzlich vermissen, das wir in Gott besaßen. Ein derartiges **Verlieren trat ein durch den ersten menschlichen Ungehorsam,** dem ein solcher in der Geisterwelt voran gegangen war. In Dunkel hüllt sich das Gehen eigener Wege vonseiten jener Geister, die durch Sünde unselig wurden. Wahrscheinlich, damit ein solch unheilbarer Fall „nicht wieder vorkomme," ließ Gott die Versuchung des Menschen zu, dem ja freie Wahl eignete. In jedem andern Verhältnis zwischen ihm und uns hat Gott den Anfang gemacht, nur nicht in dieser unsrer Verfehlung gegen ihn. Was dann dieser Verlust in sich schloß, wie weit die Kluft, wie hoch die Scheidewand wurde, das schildert die weitere biblische Geschichte. Wir erkennen daraus, daß Gott verlieren den **Verlust des Lebensprinzips** in sich schließt. Indem der Mensch sich vom lebendigen Verkehr mit Gott absonderte, hat er zugleich die Liebesharmonie des Universums zerstört. Dadurch, daß er sich in den Bannkreis des Todes begibt, trägt er den verderblichen Zwiespalt auch in Gottes übrige Schöpfung hinein und macht die Erde zum verfluchten Acker. Der mißachtete Warner seiner Gewissensstimme ist dem Menschen zum quälenden Ankläger geworden.

In ähnlicher Art war auch seitdem mit jeder neuen entscheidenden Sünde einzelner oder ganzer Gruppen ein Gottverlieren verbunden, für das es **ohne eine zu aller Sühne bereite Herzensbuße keine Erneuerung** gibt. Bei den Stammeltern freilich handelte es sich doch wohl nur um ein vorübergehendes Verlieren; was ja auch beim Ungehorsam Mosis und bei Hiobs „Verwünschung des Tages seiner Geburt" zutrifft. Gestützt auf Gottes gnadenreiche Verheißung vom Schlangenzertreter, mögen die ersten Eltern schon bald nach dem Fall auf Wiederherstellung des zerstörten Verhältnisses mit Gott zuversichtlich gebaut haben, da sie wahrscheinlich bereits in einem ihrer eigenen Söhne das Erscheinen des Zugesagten erwarteten. So aber hat ein gewisses Gottesbewußtsein und die Hoffnung auf einen kommenden Erretter seitdem schwerlich irgendeinen Zweig der sich ausbreitenden Menschheitsfamilie dauernd verlassen. Mangelte auch den übrigen Völkern jene klarere Erkenntnis, die Israel durch Offenbarung zuteil ward, so begegnen uns doch in den besten Vertretern heidnischer Völker solch aufrichtige Gottsucher, wie Sokrates und Plato.

Neben dem allgemeinen Abirren heidnischer Völker gibt es jedoch **ein Gottverlieren, das unsägliche Schuld in sich schließt.** Solches geschieht, wenn ein Mensch, wie Judas sich gegen das Heilige

dauernd verschließt; oder eine Gemeinschaft, eine Volkspartei wissentlich und geflissentlich Gottes Majestät lästert, ihn gar theatralisch absetzt und wieder einsetzt, wie die französischen Republikaner taten oder auch die auf allerlei unsinnige Weise jenen nachäffenden russischen Gewalthaber heute tun. Solcher Gruppenabfall hat sich noch stets selbst gerichtet; auch schon indem greuliche Unsittlichkeit ihm das Malzeichen des Tieres aufdrückte. Wo Menschen derart Gottes Gegenwart, seinen Geist verleugnen, sind sie dem Zustand und Gericht der Verstockung nahe, wenn nicht schon verfallen. Doch wer vermag jene Irrlichter, mit oder ohne Hebels „flüürige Marcher" auch nur annähernd zu benennen, die haltlose Menschen ins Verderben locken; führen doch mehr Irrwege zur Gottlosigkeit, als Straßen nach Rom führen.

Schon längeres gleichgültiges Verhalten gegen den Herrn, sein Reich, das Seelenheil, auch maßlose Sparsamkeit sogenannter Frommer führt endlich zu immer restloserem Gelöstsein vom Lebensquell: weil ja der Mensch je länger desto weniger den Heilsweg in Christo ernstlich beschreitet. Sein: Wer nicht wider uns, ist für uns — wird endlich doch zum entscheidenden: Wer nicht mit mir ist, der ist wider mich! Wohl wurde „dem vornehmsten unter den Sündern" überschwengliche Gnade zuteil, weil er aufrichtig Buße tat; wer aber, wie Franz Moor gegen alle Geistesmahnung sich brutal verschließt, der findet schließlich keinen Raum zur Buße. Mit recht heißt es dann: Gott verloren, alles verloren. Geht eine derartige Seele „an ihren Ort," so geschieht es mit der verzweifelten Hoffnungslosigkeit des Genannten: „Gnade jedem Sünder . . . . Ich allein bin verworfen!" — Unvergebene Schuld, über diesen bodenlosen Abgrund der Trennung von Gott hat ja der Erlöser eine Brücke geschlagen, jenen heiligen und sicheren Weg, den auch Toren nicht verfehlen. Doch nur ehrliche Gottsucher beschreiten diesen Weg, Menschen, die sich vor allem sehnen nach Schuldvergebung und erbarmender Gottesgnade, nach Reinigung und Heiligung.

2. Gott zu suchen ist der erhabene Zweck menschlichen Daseins und nichts andres kann den Menschen so heilsam beeinflußen. **Im Gottsuchen kommt ja die kindliche Seele jenem liebenden Gotteswillen entgegen,** den Paulus auf dem Areopag in die Worte kleidet: Gott hat die Menschen dazu geschaffen, daß sie ihn suchen sollten, ob sie ihn spüren und finden möchten. Vgl. Akt. 17, 27. Wenn nun Sellers, in „Majorenn gewordene Religion" sagt: „In den Uebeln des Lebens haben wir die Wurzel aller Religion zu finden; in einem irdischen Paradies hätte kein Mensch eine Religion entwickelt," so mag das ja plausibel klingen, verschweigt aber des Menschen Ursprung und jenes Gottesbewußtsein, das sich auch unabhängig

einige Sohn, der nach dem Maßstab entscheidet: Das habt ihr mir getan! — Sein Leben als Mensch und Bruder sollte uns auch dies beweisen, daß Gott nicht eine ideale Kategorie, sondern ein gegenwärtiger, heiliger und gütiger Vater ist, uns näher als der Odem oder Hand und Fuß. Nie könnten wir den Unsichtbaren auch nur verstehen, außer wir werden erleuchtet, beseelt, erneuert durch den Geist dessen, der mit dem Vater eins ist und als **Gottmensch die einzig ausreichende Verbindung zwischen uns und Gott** in sich darstellt.

Die Bibel ist das rechte Buch für alle, die zur Erkenntnis Gottes und in seine Gemeinschaft gelangen möchten. Raummangel verbietet uns, auch nur die hervorragendsten Gestalten biblischer Gottsucher hier zu streifen, denen allen Jesus durch lebenslangen, heiligtreuen Gehorsam voran leuchtet. Ist er etwa nicht der unerreichte Typ dafür, daß wir eben darum Gott suchen, weil wir mehr als nur Bewußtsein um ihn in uns tragen? Bestätigt uns nicht auch Hiob's heldenhaftes Ringen um Klarheit, sowie eines Luthers bange Herzensfrage: Wie bekomm ich einen gnädigen Gott? — daß **persönliche Gewißheit um Gottes rechtfertigende Gnade allem ernstlichen Gottsuchen zugrunde** liegt? Ohne Gebetsringen ist göttliche Gnade schwerlich zu erlangen, da wir eben durch jenes dem unermüdlichen Suchen Gottes am besten entgegenkommen.

„Ohne den Suchergott gäbe es keine Gottsucher." Weil er uns sucht, vgl. Hes. 34, 11, und in seiner gottmenschlichen Verbindung uns fand, können auch wir ihn finden. Suchen wir ihn, wie er uns rät, in kindlichem Gebet, so wird uns seine Größe und Nähe kund und wir werden beseelt zu neuem Gehorsam gegen ihn. Vgl. Theol. Mgz. 1930, „On Prayer, by M. Haas," S. 5 und 7. Wir müssen es uns versagen auf die **Arten eines entgleisten Gottsuchens** näher einzugehen, wofür besonders in den heidnischen und im Kreis der sogenannten katholischen Religionen sich eine Fülle von Beispielen findet. Sowohl im Buddhismus als in den früheren (?) russischen Sekten der Skopzen und Duchoborzen, aber auch sonst, wo man mit Hintansetzung der menschlich-sozialen Liebespflicht Gott sucht, handelt es sich im Grunde doch um eine Art sublimierten Egoismus. Nur in Gemeinschaft mit unsern menschlichen Mitbrüdern können wir uns als Kinder des einen Vaters in Christo beweisen.

Auch Scholastiker und Mystiker des Mittelalters gingen eigenartige Wege des Gottsuchens. Ein Teil ersterer geriet auf Irrwege, manche der letzteren auf den Abweg der Geringschätzung der menschlichen Natur. Dafür aber waren es zwei Zweige der Mystiker, die zu **Vorkämpfern für die verantwortliche Haushalterschaft aller Christen** wurden. Einem Mystiker wird auch der Ausspruch

von Wohl oder Uebel in jenem Sehnen nach Frieden, dem Heiligen, ganz Anderen, einem sündlosen Dasein unverkennbar ausdrückt. Nicht alles Suchen hat ja Gott selbst zum Ziel und so wird wohl das Gefundene meist dem Gesuchten entsprechen. Suchen wir nur Ideen und Definitionen, so können wir nicht erwarten Realitäten zu finden.

Jener Dorpater stud. philos., der vom Schreiber befragt, warum er so rastlos seine Stube durchschreite, ihm erwiederte: Ich suche einen Gottesbegriff — hätte sich doch selbst sagen können, daß ein Erfassen der Wesensart des Ewigen menschliches Vermögen überschreite. Soll unser **Suchen zielbewußter Art** sein, so dürfen wir die Hilfsmittel, die Gottes Wort uns bietet, nicht außer acht lassen. Gott wirklich zu begegnen, erfordert vor allem noch immer jener von ihm einst dem alten Israel gebotenen **Vorbereitung durch besondre Reinigung und Heiligung.** Die in jener Mönchssage geisterhaft vermittelte Kunde von einem „totaliter aliter" im Jenseits enthält schier ebensoviel an Wahrheitskern, als ein Paulus von seinem „Entzücktwerden" zu berichten vermochte. Unaussprechbare Worte hörte er dabei, die Zustände und Dinge ausdrückten, welche menschlicher Erfahrung entrückt sind; die wir uns aber zuweilen bemühen in gesteigerten Superlativen anzudeuten, wie: Aller Weisheit höchste Fülle, oder etwa: Aller Freudenwonne Krone, — falls wir uns nicht bescheiden wollen mit dem alle Superlative potenzierenden schlichten Ausdruck: Seligkeit. Da aber sichtbare und unsichtbare Schöpfung von dem einen Gott herstammen, können sie freilich nicht derart grundverschieden sein, daß in ihnen etwa die sittlichen Axiome, nach göttlicher und menschlicher Bewertung, nicht übereinstimmten; wodurch ja für uns auch alles Schriftverständnis hinfiele.

A. Alexander sagt in "Christianity and Ethics," S. 128: Now, while the writers of the New Testament differ in their mode of presenting the ultimate goal of man, they are at one in regarding it as an exalted form of life. What they all seek to commend, is a condition of being, involving a gradual assimilation to, and communion with God. The distinctive gift of the Gospel is the gift of life: "I am the life," says Christ. And the apostle's confession is in harmony with his Master's claim—"For me to live is Christ." —Salvation is nothing else than the restoration, preservation, and exaltation of life. . . : "I am come, that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." More life and fuller, is the passion of every soul, that has caught the vision and heard the call of Jesus.

Eines Philippus' Heischen: Zeige uns den Vater . . . . und jenes Jünglings Verlangen nach ewigem Leben, sind doch im Grund

identisch, wie ja auch Jesu Worte, Joh. 17, 30 das dartun: „Das ist das ewige Leben, daß sie dich, daß du allein wahrer Gott bist, und den du gesandt hast, Jesum Christum erkennen." Christus selbst aber ist es, der das Gesuchte — Gott und ewiges Leben in sich vereint. Er bleibt die eine Notwendigkeit der Seele, gegen die das Uebrige schwindet, wie Dämmerschatten beim Morgenlicht. **Somit dürfen wir als Gottsucher solche kennzeichnen, deren innerstes Streben nach dem Heiligen, Erkenntnis ewiger Wahrheit und Erlangung bleibenden Lebens in Christo ergeht.** Er ist es, der das rechte Heimweh in allen lebendig erhält, die aus der Wahrheit sind.

Viel zutreffender als Sellars hat doch ein Lermantow „den Ursprung der Religion" poetisch abgeleitet in seinem sinnigen Gedicht „Der Engel." Ein solcher begleitet ins irdische Leben eine Kindesseele, die seinem Gesang so innig lauscht, daß nichts auf Erden jenes Heimweh danach zu stillen vermochte. Weil ja Gottes ewige Vaterliebe uns noch immer auf mehr wie halbem Weg entgegenkam, hat es auch von Anfang Menschen gegeben, die ihn von ganzem Herzen suchten, da nichts Irdisches ihr Heimweh zu stillen vermochte. In Christo haben alle solchen den rechten Führer gefunden und nur eine in ihm zentrierende religiöse Erkenntnis befähigt uns auch zu einer wirklich abgeschlossenen und einheitlichen Weltanschauung. Mit Recht sagt J. H. Newman, in „The Grammar of Assent," S. 480: Heilung für Schuld und sittliche Schwäche finden wir . . . . in der Mittlerschaft Christi. Darum hat das Christentum von Anfang einen festen Stand in der Welt eingenommen . . . .: Es enthält das Heilmittel, das die tiefe Wunde der menschlichen Natur zu stillen und heilen vermag . . . . Darum wird und muß es auch bestehen, so lange die menschliche Natur besteht." — Die christliche Religion besteht ja ihrem Wesen nach eben in dem, was das Gottsuchen verwirklicht, so wie Jesus ihr die Bahnen weist. Was er suchte und erstrebte, muß bis zu einem bestimmten Grad das rechte Ziel seiner Nachfolger bilden.

Durch Gebet stand Jesus in anhaltender Gemeinschaft mit dem Vater, dem er Preis und Dank und hingebende Fürbitte darbrachte. Daneben hat er vor allem um Erleuchtung über des Vaters Willen und Stärkung für sein Mittleramt. Dazu wurden ihm wiederholt Engel, einmal Moses und Elias gesandt; doch kein Schauen des Vaters, nur mehrfach eine Zusage seines Wohlgefallens wird uns berichtet. Wollten wir also **mehr erzielen,** als daß Gottes „freudiger Geist" mit uns sei, dann wollten wir darin **„über den Meister sein"** und verstießen gegen seine Mahnung: „Selig sind, die nicht sehen und doch glauben." Zumal darf keiner, der seinen Weg um Christum herum nimmt, hoffen, seine potentielle Sohnschaft beim ewigen Vater zu verwirklichen. Ins Vaterhaus führt nur der

erlangen, was wir unter Gottsuchen verstehen, dann dürfen wir eins nicht übersehen, das zu all diesem die Grundbedingung ist: Weder Tugend noch Güte, selbst nicht das ewige Gut, Gott selbst, kann einen Menschen beglücken, so lange als es außerhalb der menschlichen Seele bleibt." Vgl. „Theologia Germanika," Kap. 9. Gott ist ohne sein Reich aber nicht zu haben, und sein Reich kann nicht kommen, wenn wir nicht alle Gerechtigkeit dieses Reiches erfüllen. Dazu gehört vor allem, daß wir dem Grundgebot desselben gemäß, in Bruderliebe vereint mit dem Nächsten diesem Reich zustreben. Nicht auf Thomä Einsiedlergängen, in der Gemeinschaft der in Galiläa ihn erwartenden Jünger wollte der Auferstandene sich offenbaren.

Natürlich soll damit dem Gebet hinter geschlossener Tür sein Heimrecht nicht angetastet werden. Den Kindern unsrer Zeit, die durch die komplizierten Lebensverhältnisse arg zerstreut werden, ist jene fromme Einfalt und schlichte Lebensweise der Gottsucher des Mittelalters sogar dringend zu empfehlen. Die Christen unsrer Tage sollten durchaus **mehr Raum gewinnen, sich in die Welt des Glaubens zu versenken,** um religiöse Ideale recht bewerten und im Leben verwirklichen zu lernen. In „Apostolic Optimism," S. 224, sagt J. W. Fowett: „Laßt uns mehr nachsinnen über den König in seiner Schöne, laßt uns Gemeinschaft halten mit seiner Lieblichkeit, laßt uns mehr wohnen am verborgenen Ort; und die unaussprechliche Herrlichkeit seines Antlitzes wird in uns zu jener begeisterten Passion, die unsre Feuertaufe sein wird, ein Feuer, in dem alles Unchristliche völlig verzehrt wird." Diese Worte mahnen an Zinzendorfs: „Ich habe eine Passion und die ist ER, nur Er." — Aufrichtige Gottsucher sind passionierte Leute, deren religiöse Begeisterung sich an Christi Person heftet. Weil eben auf Erden alles nur beziehungsweise Geltung hat, streben sie nach dem, auf den sich alles bezieht und hinzielt, dem Absoluten, allein Unabhängigen. Folgen wir des Geistes Leitung, so bleiben wir auch in persönlicher Beziehung mit dem ewigen Vater in Christo, durch den wir auf unsre Bitte hin Gnade um Gnade empfangen. Das nun ist die Erfahrung Gottes, wie sie aufrichtige Gottsucher von je machten und über die hinaus auch wir nicht mehr verlangen dürfen. Nicht das Sehen, der Glaube ist es ja, der uns die innere Gewißheit versiegelt von der Tatsächlichkeit unsrer Gnadenerfahrungen und der Nähe der Gnadenmacht. Ein religiös gestimmter Mensch wird darum auch — in diesem Sinn — zeitlebens ein Gottsucher bleiben.

3. Gott finden, ihn endlich von Angesicht schauen, war stets das **Endziel menschlicher Hoffnung.** Es wird dadurch verwirklicht, daß der Ewige selbst allem redlichen Suchen entgegenkommt und es zu seligen Finden werden läßt. Der ernste Trieb des Suchenden

aber verbürgt das Vorhandensein eines Restes vorsündlichen Wesens, eines überweltlichen Elementes in seiner Seele, wie ja auch Augustin bekennt:

Quia fecisti nos at te, et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te . . . Quaerentes enim invenient eum . . .

Wird aber das Gefundene etwa nicht dem **Fassungsvermögen** der einzelnen entsprechen, denen hierin, recht verstanden, eine Evolution bevorstehen mag, die auch eine weitere Erhöhung im Empfinden der Seligkeit in sich birgt? Das mag auch von jenem dauernden Schauen gelten, wie bereits von dem vorlaufenden, das manche als zeitweiliges Ziel in Visionen und dem ähnlichem erstrebten. Dem gegenüber wurde etlichen Männern der besten Periode hebräischer Geschichte ein **einzigartiger persönlicher Verkehr** mit dem Ewigen zuteil, vor allem einem Abraham und Moses. Aehnlich wieder, wie ein Moses ins gelobte Land hinein schauen durfte, ward einem Stephanus zur Sterbensfreudigkeit, einem Johannes behufs seiner Offenbarung und einem Paulus wiederholt ein **Schauen des verklärten Herrn** zuteil. Doch im allgemeinen erfuhr durch Christi Menschwerdung die Auffassung von Gottes Nähe darin einen Umschwung, daß die vordem nur einzelnen Erlesenen gegebene Zusage: Ich will mit dir sein — durch den Erlöser für alle rechten Jünger erweitert wird, in seinem: Ich bin bei euch alle Tage. Und wenn von ihm selbst kein Schauen des Vaters berichtet wird, verbürgt schon sein: Ich und der Vater sind eins — daß er auch als Mensch keines besondern anthropomorphischen Erscheinens des Vaters bedurfte.

Ein ähnliches Entzücktwerden aber, wie es Paulus erfuhr, war wohl auch das **Erstreben vieler Mystiker**; zu dem sie durch asketische Lebensweise sich zubereiteten. War letzteres zwar nur ein menschlich erdachter Notbehelf, der wohl öfter seines Zwecks verfehlte, so diente ihr Versuch doch einer verstärkten Lebensreinheit und beweist ihre Beherzigung jenes: Selig sind, die reines Herzens sind, denn sie werden Gott schauen. — Dieselbe Wahrheit bildet auch den Kern der Ritterlegenden, die von der Suche nach dem heiligen Gral berichten. Wer die wunderbare Erscheinung jener Schale erleben durfte, die mit Christi Blut gefüllt war, dem wurden geheimnisvolle Segnungen und überirdische Kräfte zuteil. Doch zum Ziel gelangte keiner, dessen Herz nicht durch aufrichtige Bekehrung gereinigt und erbarmend war. Ein solcher durfte in jener geheimnisvollen Vision gleichsam den Unsichtbaren schauen. Dadurch wurde er von Leid und Leiden befreit, geheiligt und vor Schaden bewahrt.

Einen köstlicheren Weg weist uns Christus; er sagt: Wer mich sieht, sieht den Vater. — Durch wiederholtes Versenken in dies Urbild gottmenschlicher Reinheit wird je länger desto klarer ein

Gottesebenbild in uns selbst geprägt und in uns ersteht ein Tempel des allein Heiligen, dessen Geist nun unser innerstes Wesen erfüllt. Dadurch ist „das Himmelreich inwendig in uns" und damit ist auch **die Bedingung gegeben für das etwaige Zustandekommen irgendeiner Gottschauung.**

Wenn uns doch die seelische Fähigkeit eignet, innerlich vorhandene Ideale oder Bilder auch äußerlich nachzuschauen, dürfen wir eben dieselbe Gabe dem Geist nicht absprechen; daß ihm nämlich in besonders weihevollen Momenten Gottes Immanenz sichtbar werden kann, dem Geistesauge, wie von außen her erkennbar. — Ob nicht Kindern, den legitimen Erben des Himmelreichs, mehr wie andern der Einblick in die wonnereiche Harmonie des ewigen Reiches gewährt wird? — Ein junges Knäblein, das nicht recht wohl war, durfte Schreiber kürzlich im Arme halten, wo es auch einschlief. Da, mitten im Schlummer, bekundete es in lebhaften Tönen ein derartiges Entzücken, wie schwerlich irgendein irdischer Anblick es hervorrufen könnte. — Die Befleckung der Seele ist es, die durch den Schleier des Irdischen uns oft jene geistentzückende Welt ewiger Güte und wonniger Harmonie verbergen mag. Vor allem vorschnell erstrebten Schauen will uns aber doch das Wort warnen: Wir wandeln im Glauben und nicht im Schauen. Soviel jedoch dürfen wir sagen, daß der Gesuchte selbst einem empfänglichen Gemüt entgegen kommt, ja, einen ernstlich Suchenden zuliebe mitunter auch aus seiner Verborgenheit heraustritt.

Ein derartiges Nahen Gottes geschah ja manchmal unter besonderen Zeichen oder durch Reden allein, wie zu einem Moses in Midian oder zu Samuel im Tempel. Als Schreiber unlängst in seiner Bibelklasse fragte: Wie redet Gott zu uns? — wurde mit Recht erwidert: Durch sein Wort und unser Gewissen. Zur Ergänzung durfte beigefügt werden, daß er auch mit oder ohne begleitende Zeichen oder Visionen direkt zu Menschen und zu seinem Sohn geredet hat. Bedingung und Ziel solcher besonderen Offenbarung ist aber stets **restlose Hingabe des Willens an Gott** und Annahme seines heiligen Willens. Solches mag uns ja durchaus nicht immer unmittelbar beseligen, am wenigsten nachher beim Widerspruch der Welt. Doch ist Gottes Gabe so vollkommen, daß eine stets erneute Hingabe an ihn dazu führt, daß wir großen Frieden erlangen, schon dadurch, daß der Widerspruch unsers eigenen Willens aufgehoben wird und schwindet.

Haben wir erst einmal in Christo das ewige Leben ergriffen, so sind wir schon vom Tod zum Leben durchgedrungen und das ewige Reich ist uns erschlossen. Gott ist uns nicht mehr fern, so daß wir ihn erst noch suchen müßten; und auch uns mag er in einer Vision erkennbar nahen, wenn unser Geist dafür bereitet ist.

nachgesagt: „Und wenn ich mitten im Verzuck wäre, und wüßte um ein Mütterlein, das eines Süppleins bedurfte, ich ließe Verzuck Zuck sein und brächte das Süpplein." — „Wollen wir wirklich das **Dauernd beseligen** kann uns aber kein noch so wunderbares Erlebnis visionärer Art; so wenig als etwa alle beseligt wurden, die einst Gott in Christo mit Augen sehen durften. Dieselbe überraschende, beseligende Erkenntnis aber, die einem Hiob einst endlich aufging, soll jedem redlich Suchenden zuteil werden; daß er nämlich nicht erst ins Jenseits versetzt sein muß, um Gottes Gnadennähe zu genießen, sondern daß vielmehr der Gott, den er in Christo von ganzem Herzen suchte, allezeit mit ihm war und ist, und alle Unruhe und Zweifel, die ihn quälten nur von falschgerichtetem Suchen herrührten. A. B. Alexander sagt, a. b. a. O.:

Scripture corroborates the yearnings of the heart, and represents life as a growing good, which is to attain to ever higher reaches and fuller realization in the world to come. It is the unextinguishable faith of man, that the future must crown the present: No human effort goes to waste, no gift is delusive; but every gift and every effort has its proper place as a stage in the endless process: "There shall not be one lost good. What was shall live as before."

Abschließend sagen wir, unser ganzes Pilgerleben schließt ein oft erneutes Suchen und Finden ein; doch **selig schauendes Finden soll endlich das Bleibende sein.** Auch viel ernstes Forschen nach Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit, in Natur und Menschenleben, mündet endlich in Gottsuchen. Ohne Glaubenslicht erreicht jenes aber nicht dies Ziel, sondern mag eher einem Haschen nach Irrlichtern gleichen. Wollen wir durchaus bei beschränkter Beleuchtung suchen, so mag uns ein ähnliches Fündlein, wie Wagners Homunkulus, beschert sein, dessen erkünsteltes Wesen der „rauhen Wirklichkeit" nicht standhielte. Ohne Licht von Oben sind schon so manche Forscher tiefem Unglauben verfallen. Die fundamentale Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit brauchen wir ja überhaupt nicht mehr zu suchen, daß nämlich Gott in Christo sich als ewiges Erbarmen geoffenbart hat. Suso sagt mit Recht, daß Jesu Menschheit der Weg ist, den Menschen wandeln müssen, um Gott zu finden. **Nur durch Christum können wir jenes wirkliche Gottfinden erleben,** das uns unverbrüchlich verbürgt ist schon durch die feierliche Zusage: Ich will mich von euch finden lassen; Jer. 29, 14.

Unser **Suchen allein kann also nicht Selbstzweck sein,** so daß unsers Glaubenslebens Weg und Ziel nur in rastlosem Streben nach Gott und Wahrheit aufginge. Soll es bleibenden Wert erlangen, so muß darin ein wirkliches Finden den Höhepunkt bilden;

wozu wir aber notwendig des untrüglichen Lichtes der heiligen Schrift bedürfen. Dr. Kamphausen legt dies klar, wenn er sagt:

The reality of God and his interest in man can only be taken hold of by the spiritual experience of faith. Christian faith can never do without, or go beyond the scriptures, out of which it originated. Nor can it have a healthy growth unless shared with fellow-believers. These three factors are indispensable elements of the Christian God-consciousness. Vgl. Theol. Mgz. 1929, S. 299.

Jede wahre Religion bedeutet ein wirkliches Gottsuchen. Sie kann aber nicht auf dem beruhen, was von uns an noch so ernstlichem Streben geschähe. Sie wird vielmehr dem ihr volles Vertrauen schenken, **was Gott an uns in Christo getan,** welcher der einzige Mittler auch für alle aufrichtig Suchenden bleibt. In ihm sind wir schon erlöst von sündenbanger Heimatlosigkeit, **wir sind gefunden,** entbunden vom Sündenbann. Der Urteilsschluß in Faust: Nicht verloren — gerettet! — ist derselbe, der nach dem Willen der ewigen Liebe auch unser bleibendes Geschick besiegeln soll. Wohl wird ja im Stückwerk auch unser bestes Streben nur ein vorwärts tastendes Suchen und nur zeitweiliges Empfinden göttlicher Gnadennähe bleiben; doch das erstarkende, immer unbedingtere Gottvertrauen führt **endlich zum Schauen des Ewigen.**

Gott suchen und ihn finden, wie scheinen sie manchmal so weit auseinander zu liegen. Wie so ähnlich erscheint das eine oft dem trüben, schier hoffnungslosen Wandeln nach dem Grab des Meisters; wohl gar, trotz offenen Grabes und Engelerscheinung, in die trostlose Klage ausklingend: Sie haben meinen Herrn weggenommen; und ich weiß nicht, wo sie ihn hingelegt haben! Das andre jenem beseligenden Erkennen vergleichbar: Ich habe den Herrn gesehen; schon im unbekannten Nächsten im Garten war er selbst mir so nahe! — Wer im gnadenreichen Osterlicht solch seligen Erlebens wandeln will, hat nur getreulich der Gottesleitung zu folgen, die das Wort heiliger Offenbarung uns bietet. Ein Leben hingebender Nächstenliebe, ein herzlich dienendes „Fußwaschen der Mitjünger" erstrahlt schon vom Glanz ewiger Herrlichkeit. Solche Liebe ist der heilende Ausfluß vom ewigen Quell, göttlichen Wesens selber. Herzlich erbarmende Liebe kann ja nur der recht üben, der das Eingreifen heiliger Gnade selbst erlebte. Wer in solcher Liebe bleibt, der bleibt in Gott und Gott in ihm; denn Gott ist die Liebe.

„Wir sind in seiner Nähe und leben immer so,
Als ob das Aug ihn sähe, wandeln von Herzen froh."

EDITORIALS

AN EXPLANATION

The July number of the "Magazine" went out to its readers with considerable delay. Besides, the Book-Review showed a decided shrinking, filling only a few pages while the average length has been ten to twelve. And there may have been other defects. All this requires an explanation. The editor had been in impaired health for some time. Then trouble developed in his congregation. He began to feel that his days in his field might be numbered. It was a trying experience and fell on his already shattered system with sudden and devastating effect. Pretty soon his nerves gave out, he couldn't sleep; the nervous break-down was complete. He handed in his resignation and on the 10th of May, he went with his wife, to Greenport, Long Island, N. Y., to recuperate. There he stayed 8 weeks and returned to Cleveland on July 3rd. The work on the "Magazine" was done under very great difficulties. The editor couldn't read many books; he was unable to do any work while at Greenport. He hopes the readers will consider all this and exercise great lenience in view of the fact that circumstances not under our control were responsible for our experience.

IN THE VALLEY OF BACA

Psalm 84, 6.

The 84th Psalm has long been one of our favorites; we have preached many a sermon on it, or parts of it. It deals with the blessings of the godly and enumerates four: God is their joy, their strength, their consolation, their goal. Our mind is on the third to-day: "God is their consolation when they pass through the valley of Baca," i. e. of weeping. We have selected this for a very particular reason: this writer has been passing through that valley. Just at this time he seems to be on the upward grade, but for a long time he couldn't see the light.

All of us are at times led into the valley and perhaps may do well by keeping it to ourselves until the clouds lift again. But the editor can't wait that long. For various reasons. For instance, when his paper doesn't come out at the proper time, shouldn't he inform his readers why he, and it, are lacking in promptness? So he may be pardoned if he draws the curtains aside a little and makes out of his own experience an "editorial."

The editor, as most of our readers know, belongs in the class

of ministers many members of our congregations have no use for: he is an old man. For some time there has been, therefore, with a minority the desire to get a young man instead. But last fall, shortly before the General Conference, this desire found more open expression—and now the trouble began. Unfortunately, we brought to the struggle weak nerves and before long our sleep was much broken; a little later we were a victim of insomnia.

Here we must make the confession that we ourselves were much to blame. For a great many years we have used hypnotics of various kinds. We never took any but which were recommended and approved of by the doctors. But we came to rely on them more and more. Finally, when we got into the "Valley of Baca," these remedies became our regular comforters. And they are wretched comforters. It was a case of driving out the devil with Beelzebub, and pretty soon we found ourselves compelled to choose between the devil and Beelzebub, so to say. We chose the former, i. e. we gave up the hypnotics altogether and chose rather to be sleepless. It was a heroic choice, so some said, even our doctor; however, we felt far from heroic.

It says in the psalm: "the godly, in the valley of Baca, make it a well, the rain also filleth the pools." James Moffatt, in his new translation, has it thus: "when they pass through "Weary-Glen," fountains flow for their refreshing, blessings rain upon them." That is an admirable rendering, bringing out the valuable thought that the godly in their trials may count on help whether it comes from below ("fountains") or above ("rain"), from earth (men) or heaven (God, in his more direct and immediated blessings).

We said, we didn't feel heroic, because we found it hard to dig wells of consolation; and the heavens seemed to withhold refreshing rains of divine comfort. We had been preaching the gospel of saving love for 40 years and more. We knew that Paul learned to believe that God who gave us Christ would give us all other things with him and because of him. But we couldn't, like the apostle, shout confidently: "In all these things we are more than conquerors." We found the Valley of Weeping an exceedingly dreary place, and it grieved us that we couldn't live up to our own preaching and the apostle's triumphant experience.

"FOUNTAINS FLOWING FOR THEIR REFRESHING"

Then, when our own spade did not seem to reach deep enough to open the wells below, fountains were nevertheless opened for our refreshing. We looked around and there were many who had had worse experiences and had triumphed over them. It was in a

Long Island village that we had looked for refuge and it was here where the fountains began to flow. The "inn" where we, i. e. the wife and ourselves, registered as guests, gave shelter to some noble souls. There was a Mrs. Jeffery, nearly 85 years of age, who some years before, had broken her hip. She was taken to the hospital and had been fastened by the doctors to a board, to prevent the curvature of the spine which already existed, from getting worse. For 10 long weeks she had remained in that position, day and night. Later she had been transferred to this inn and had now been confined to her room for over three years. She was never without pain and sometimes pain was very severe. But she never talked of her troubles, unless the visitors brought up the subject themselves. Why, she said, if I wanted to tell everybody about my tribulations, I should soon have nobody to tell them to. Instead, she received every visitor in a cheerful spirit. She took a lively interest in the questions and events of the day, and in the experiences of her friends. Her little room was seldom without company, and she dispensed more encouragement and good advice to others than she received herself. She had been the daughter of a once rich family, and while she talked much about her ancestors and took pride in their achievements, she never even mentioned the loss of her fortune.

There was also a man there from Louisville, Kentucky, a brother of the hostess. He had been sorely tried in the furnace of affliction. He had undergone an operation for appendicitis, and afterward the incision began to run. For 8 months he had to have it dressed every morning and evening, the festering sore spreading an awful odor. Finally they filled it with bismuth to take an X-ray picture, and—lo and behold—the bismuth and the puss itself came out, and he was healed!

It seemed a real miracle, and why wonder at it so much—the man's patience, good courage and sweetness of disposition had also been marvelous. We asked him how he had kept up under such trying circumstances. He said he had learned to live each day only for the one day, leaving all the rest to God, and so had been able to do all his office work inspite of his condition. When we heard his story we could only say, with the others: "This is of the Lord's doing and is marvelous in our eyes."

Other cases could be mentioned in this connection of "fountains flowing for our refreshment," in our very neighborhood; not in the bible or in bible times, not when men had not given up yet their belief in miracles. No, in our own age and dispensation, examples of moral miracles, so great and real and astounding as ever happened in the time of the prophets and apostles. They,

without exception, happened to laymen and laywomen, but what minister would not be glad if such cases of self-conquest and victorious faith were to be found in his own life?

"HERE I RAISE MY EBEN EZER"

A number of the guests of our place of refuge were sitting together in Mrs. Jeffery's room (see above). It was a remarkable gathering. We have spoken of Mrs. Jeffery, the heroic old lady, who inspite of insomnia, of lameness, of pain, and of loneliness had achieved an equanimity of mind seldom found among the healthy and fortunate. There was a Mrs. Rose, also 'way above the scriptural limits of life (see Ps. 90: 10), of a critical and somewhat sarcastic spirit, tinged with modernism. She was in the habit of saying that there were many passages in the Bible she couldn't understand and accept (e. g. the doctrine of everlasting punishment); there was the hostess, the genial, tireless, optimistic head of the place; and others. They were all good Methodists but now—as life will have it—a little sophisticated. However, they were not just then discussing the shortcomings of the church and church people. Someone quoted the line we have put at the head of this little article: "Here I raise my Eben Ezer," and someone asked what was the meaning of this phrase, so often sung with vigor and relish. And it was found that none of the godly women had the key to the hackneyed line. That may seem strange enough, but, nevertheless such was the case. So it was decided to lay the matter before the clergyman that had been on the guest list for some time. He, a minister and a Doctor" (D.D.) at the same time, would know. Yes, the Doctor knew. He told them it meant "Stone of help" and referred to the victory Samuel and his people had achieved over the Philistines. He even knew the very place in the scriptures (Sam. ch. 7), where it is told, and so was able to get a little credit for his astounding acquaintance with the scriptures. The "Doctor" knew he deserved little enough praise for that. He only hoped that—it being the end of his stay at the place—he would be in a position to actually raise up for himself that "stone of help;" to say I came here a sick man and now I am well. Unfortunately, this was not so to be. They told him that oftentimes the real beneficial effect of a cure is found later. With that consoling prospect he left Greenport. He is still hoping that those people may not be altogether wrong, that soon it may be an actual experience what is now only an object of hope.

Der Pastor auf der Bank des Zuhörers.

Während unsers Aufenthalts in Greenport, Long Island (siehe oben), hatten wir Gelegenheit, unter verschiedenen Kanzeln zu sitzen und die Sonntagsfeier von dem Sitz des Zuhörers aus zu betrachten. Greenport ist ein kleiner Platz im nordöstlichen Teil von Long Island, im Norden berührt es den Long Island Sund (Sound), im Süden schaut es auf einen Teil der sogenannten Peconic Bay. Von dieser Bay, so hörten wir, hat einer gesagt, er habe die schönsten Meerbusen der Welt gesehen, selbst den weltberühmten von Neapel, aber die Peconic Bay sei die Königin von allen. Der Ort (3400 Einwohner) lebt vom Fischfang, vom Schiffbau und von dem, was damit zusammenhängt. Wohin man blickt, taucht das Wasser auf, und allezeit wehen erfrischende Briesen, Kühlung verbreitend.

Kirchlich scheint der Platz gut versorgt. Methodisten, Baptisten, Presbyterianer, Episkopale und Lutheraner haben je eine Kirche. Auch die Katholiken sind vertreten. Am Sonntag um ¼ vor 10 Uhr fangen sie alle an zu läuten, dreimal vor der Sonntagsschule in Zwischenräumen von je fünf Minuten, und dreimal vor den Gottesdiensten. Uns war dies vielfache, wenig harmonische Geläute wenig ansprechend. Hätte eine große Kirche voll und dröhnend ihr Glockenspiel ertönen lassen, so wäre es feierlich gewesen. So aber, wie es war, war das dünne und oft wiederholte Geklingel nur eine Illustration des vielgespaltenen Protestantismus. Seine Kirchen wollen alle da sein und gehört werden, im Grund aber hat die eine so wenig Besonderes zu sagen wie die andre.

Den Eindruck hat man auch, wenn man hineingeht. Der Gang des Gottesdienstes ist überall derselbe, von den Episkopalen abgesehen. Und für den episkopalen Gottesdienst haben wir weder Verständnis noch Neigung. Wer darin aufgewachsen ist, mag ihn lieben, wir haben ihn noch stets geisttötend gefunden.

Beim Singen steht man auf, und da manche Prediger viele Verse singen lassen, ist das Stehen eine ermüdende Sache. Beim Beten bleibt man sitzen. Das ist gut, zumal bei dem sogenannten „long prayer." Der Methodistenprediger betete zehn bis fünfzehn Minuten. Gott hat mehr Geduld als wir, doch sollte der Beter bedenken, was Jesus von dem „viele Worte machen" gesagt hat. Uns war es ein Greuel und Scheuel.

Die Chöre waren alle schwach. Zuweilen tat sich eine starke Stimme hervor, wie in dem Chor der Baptisten. Die leitende Sängerin dort hatte ein übermächtiges Organ. Sie wußte es auch und sang deshalb fünf Verse, statt zwei oder drei.

Die Predigtgabe war bei den lokalen Predigern nur schwach vertreten, der Methodist hatte noch am meisten, aber er war lang-

atmig; das ist etwas, das unsre Zeit schwer trägt. Schon Luther sagte: Hör bald auf! Wie vielmehr ist das nötig in unsrer schnelllebenden Zeit.

Im ganzen hatten wir von den Gemeinden den Eindruck, daß sie geistlich im Schlummer liegen. Sie kommen zur Kirche gemäß ihrem „Wandel nach väterlicher Weise," aber es fehlt der alte Geist, der Tod ist im Topf. Man ehrt die Kirche als eine übernommene wertvolle Institution, aber ihr Herz ist anderswo, es ist bei den Dingen dieser Erde. Man hängt Sonntags ein festliches Mäntelchen um, aber im Grund sieht man in der Kirche mehr die Pflegerin geselligen Lebens als die Mutter des geistlichen. Die Pastoren halten „Sermonetts" für die Kinder, aber es waren keine Kinder da. Jünglinge fehlten auch. Einer von ihnen sagte uns: Warum sollte ich in die Kirche gehen und mich eine Stunde langweilen? Derselbe später: „Wer nicht schlafen kann, sollte in die Kirche gehen." Seine Mutter wollte dennoch ein gutes Wort für die Kirche einlegen. Sie sagte: „Wer jeden Sonntag zur Kirche geht, erhält ‚a liberal education,' denn der rechte Pastor gibt Wissenschaft, Kunst, ‚current events,' Politik und Lebensweisheit usw. in seiner Predigt gebührenden Platz." Sie war eine Methodistin, aber vom modernen Geist stark angeweht.

Ueberall in den vielen kleinen Orten Long Islands sehen wir Kirchen genug. Sie sind ein wesentlicher Teil des Ortsbildes. An prominenter Stelle gelegen, einfach, doch wohlerhalten, fügen sie sich ihrer Umgebung würdig und oft stilvoll ein. Sie zeugen von der Wertschätzung der christlichen Religion seitens der Väter. Das jetzige Geschlecht fühlt, es liegt ein Segen drin, aber es weiß ihn nicht zu heben, oder es weiß nicht, ihn der modernen Situation anzupassen. Der alte Erweckungsgeist mit seiner Methode der Einzelbekehrung ist dahin, wie orthodox man auch sonst in seiner Theologie sei, und das soziale Evangelium scheint der mächtigen Gefühlselemente zu ermangeln, die uns ein so wesentlicher Teil unsers religiösen Lebens waren.

Das neunzehnhundertjährige Fest der Geistausgießung hat uns auf die Notwendigkeit der Entbindung himmlischer Kräfte hingewiesen. Doch das ist nun vorüber, hat es viel erreicht? — Jedenfalls war es heilsam, den göttlichen Machtfaktor stark zu betonen. Was Methode und Ziel unsrer Arbeit in dieser neuen Zeit sein solle, mögen führende Geister mehr oder weniger klar sehen. Es dauert aber lange, bis die Kirchen als Ganzes sich im Marsch befinden. Inzwischen breitet sich Gleichgültigkeit und Weltsinn mächtig aus, ob es nun in Long Island sei oder auf dem großen Festland, und die Kirche wird einen schweren Stand haben die Aufgaben zu erfüllen, welche die Zeit und Gott von ihr fordern.

The Christian World

Safe Out of Russia

From a letter by the Rev. Alfred Huehn, Pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Kaunas (Kovno), Lithuania

Translated by Dr. George A. Simons from Der Christliche Apologete, Cincinnati

"At present we are witnesses of one of the greatest tragedies. By hundreds they pass through Lithuania evening after evening, the German colonist refugees of Russia, in order to find a temporary home in Germany and later, who knows where in the wide world? The world will see and hear little or nothing of the unspeakable misery which has afflicted thousands of these colonists. They come from distant Siberia, from the Volga region, from Crimea, and from my own home, the Caucasus. It is profoundly stirring to hear what these unfortunate ones relate to the people who storm the train; what the poorest of them had to endure, a martyrdom, far worse than the Inquisition.

"It is the —nth transport which passes through Kovno this evening. Having a free evening, I walked down to the station. The train has arrived. I go from coach to coach and seek one of the refugees whose opinion, or judgment, should be reliable. This brother is sixty-eight years old and is a member of the Moravian Society. 'God be praised and thanked,' he says. 'We have escaped from the land of hell.' And then follows the description of conditions in Russia.

"The proclamation of the gospel is made impossible, and is only permitted in the 'House of Prayer' (meeting house). Otherwise the preacher and listener are threatened with a severe penalty. But even with this the enemies of religion are not satisfied. One day the eye of the law discovers some weaknesses in the prayer house, and the building is declared in need of repair and closed, never to reopen.

"Only the unsuspected members of the Communist Party receive ration cards. Preachers, especially, are not entitled to the same because they belong to the *kulaks* (wealthy peasant class) who are also called '*fists*', 'enemies of the new order.' However, the *kulak*, like the preacher, has the 'privilege' to pay taxes. Woe unto them if they do not pay. In such a case the farm of the *kulak* is auctioned and turned over to loyal party friends and the preacher is exiled. O, a faithful God, who provided for us and did not permit us to die a death of starvation!'

"Another one tells this story: 'Every tax or levy that was imposed upon me I endeavored to deliver conscientiously. Still, the more I gave, the more was demanded. In addition, I had to care for a number of families which had been allotted to me by the commune. Thus it occurred that we ourselves had nothing to eat and hunger overtook us. So we decided to abandon everything and to hasten away. One

morning very early I led my two horses and three cows out of the stable and in order that they should not starve, let them go out on the field. I took the most necessary things, tied them in a bundle and departed with my wife. The cattle followed us. My dear wife paused with tear-filled eyes, and I called to her, "Escape for thy life!" With hesitating steps she followed and we left everything to its fate. My good neighbor, a Russian, who is faring much the same, weeps bitterly and begs me to take him along. However, since he is a Russian, he dares not cross over the boundary except on penalty of death.

"'Our children they take away from us in order to train them in their atheistic ideas. The futility of prayer is demonstrated to the children and they are told, for example: "Children, the God of your parents and teacher does not exist at all. Pray and you will soon learn that He cannot help you. Now you see that there is no God," says he.'

"Outside the train the men and youths are standing. In the coaches are the exhausted women and children. Many of the mothers have from five to ten children, some of them with children two days old, which they have lying in a box at their side, or holding in their arms, and these are sucking on the mother's empty breast. Death lies on their little faces. Others on the train are sick. I think of the verse, 'Woe unto them that give suck in those days and pray that your flight be not in the winter.' It is the second of December, cold and raw.

"'And whither are you now bound?' I ask. 'We go to Germany, the land of our forefathers, then, then—we know not. But thank God that we have escaped from hell!'

"I request the old man to give a message to the hundreds of Germans who have gathered at the station. This he does. There is no complaining, no moaning, about the loss and the injustice, but praise of God and thanks to those who have helped them and brought gifts to their children and wives. Thereupon he offers a prayer. I cannot help but speak a word to the parting ones and those remaining behind. No heart remains cold and no eye dry.

"'Now thank we all our God,'

the homeless ones begin singing. We join with them singing and then follow with our answer: 'A mighty fortress is our God.' Stanza after stanza is being sung. So we see them continue their journey. Whither? I ask myself. And I give myself the answer: 'To the Eternal Home.'

"The next day we read in the newspaper: 'The —th transport of German refugees from Russia passed Kovno last evening. Four hundred thirty-five souls, among them 265 children. Other transports follow.'"—*Christian Advocate.*

Dark Days for Russian Christians

The severity of the Russian Soviet Republic's measures against religion must touch a chord of sympathy in every heart that is capable of religious emotion. The information given by the scant cables from

Moscow is supported by trustworthy accounts from other sources, and leaves no room for doubt that the Communist government, and the unofficial organizations which under other names carry out its policies and shoulder its ugly responsibilities, is bent on the extermination of every religious organization, institution, or agency whose object is to propagate, nurture, or sustain religion.

The following paragraphs, selected almost at random from unpublished reports that have escaped the Soviet censorship, will give some glimpses into the distressful land whose government has declared war on God:

The Christian press is practically extinct. The Christian papers are not stopped officially but gradually exterminated under the pretext of lack of paper, or through the printers being compelled to stop working, and so on.

The tired congregations sent deputations to the headquarters of the central authorities, with innumerable proofs of the continuous and universal persecution of the Christians in Russia, because of their faith. The central authorities merely responded tauntingly: "What nonsense! It is impossible! We have the law permitting freedom of confession." And everything remained as it was.

The terrorized youths are absent from the meetings of believers, at least in the central towns, and the reason for this is that when Christian faith is openly confessed you are deprived of labor and of the indispensable bread-card.

Before the elections of soviets, representatives, even elder brothers are absent from church. Those openly working for Christianity and the sincere Christians are deprived of the right to vote. There would be no trouble if the believers would cease mixing in politics, but such "useless people" who do not take part in politics are deprived of their bread-card, with the general economical collapse that means famine for the "useless citizens" and their families. Congresses of Christians are not forbidden, but are made practically impossible to organize. Someone ventured to ask permission from the Soviet authorities to organize a Christian meeting. The authorities said, "Yes, but you must give us the list of Christians who will take part." Naturally the brethren preferred to resign from the plan of holding congresses for fear that the list of partakers would be used to designate the more active brethren, "useless people," or the "cardless" condemned to hunger.

The foundations of family life are being mercilessly trodden down. I was at a preacher's; he and his wife are white of hair, and two daughters lamented unconsoled, for the communists had insulted them. This wronged preacher was put out from his home, hungry and destitute, and with the daughters sick. They asked me for help and I gave them my three last rubles, and both the parents and the daughters began to weep. The president of an executive committee wrote an official note with seal and three signatures commanding that the wife

should leave her husband and come to them; then you shall have everything in plenty; otherwise neither you nor your husband will have the possibilities for life, as he spreads religious intoxication.

In M. the authorities gave our brethren an old tumble-down house under the condition that they would restore it. All was fixed up in writing and at a notary's. When the Soviet authorities had inspected and approved of the repairs made to the house, a special festival service was announced; many debts had been made for restoring the house and it was hoped to defray them at least in part through offerings. But oh! soon there appeared before me "Komsomolzi," members of young people's communist clubs, and after the meeting part of the benches were thrown out by them; on the rest they seated themselves and declared the house occupied by them. The brethren appealed everywhere to have the house returned to them. In spite of official documents, negative answers were given everywhere. At length even the commissariat refused to return the premises, with the words: "The young men are more necessary for us than your useless religious assemblies," and thus matters remained. I could still relate many other similar occurrences.

Children up to eighteen years are forbidden to assist at (take part in) church service. This is rigorously controlled. Now even home prayers are interrupted.

Much more might be given. What more is needed to demonstrate the deadly purpose of the government to blot out religion in order that its own social and economic principles may hold undisputed sway?

It is said that protests from outside Russia will be futile. The Pope has lifted his great voice, and has been denounced by Russian journals as a "stuffed scarecrow." The Archbishop of Canterbury and great assemblies of English Christians have expressed their horror of Soviet oppression and sympathy with the oppressed. The Russians reply with taunts at these "paid tools of Western capitalism," which uses "kept clergy" to support its privileges against the workers of the world. Yet Christians can not and must not hold their peace when their brothers and sisters are suffering for their faith. The remedy may not lie within the field of governmental action. Probably neither Great Britain nor America should take arms against the Russian on such a quarrel. But that is no reason why prayers for Russian believers should not rise in every Christian congregation, or why protests, broadcast through whatever channels may offer, congregations, preachers' meetings, conferences, etc., should not go out against the satanic policy of STALIN.

Christianity is indestructible. It will survive MARX, LENIN, STALIN and all their kind. Eventually the anvil will wear out the hammers. Meanwhile, let us who are of the day make the spirit of Christ and the fellowship of a common faith effective in every way that may be open.—*Christian Advocate.*

The End of an Era

Condensed from The Outlook and Independent (February 5, '30)

FREDERICK LEWIS ALLEN
One of the editors of "Harper's" Magazine

Recently a magazine editor and a newspaper editor were talking in my office.

"It seems to be getting harder each month," said the magazine editor, "to find live topics for magazine discussion. Divorce, prohibition and law enforcement, the warfare between religion and science, the new psychological theories—they all begin to look stale. And there seems to be nothing to take their place—nothing that really interests people. Is the public mind becoming apathetic?"

"I have noticed the same thing," answered the newspaper editor. "I believe we are approaching the end of an era. We are in for a change in the intellectual weather, and this is the lull that comes before it."

Many things have happened of late which seem to me to substantiate that idea. We seem to have reached the end of an era, the Post-War Period. That period had certain outstanding characteristics.

First, it has been an era of disillusion. The pumped-up idealism and fervor of war-time was followed by cynicism, by a general smashing of idols. Witness the reduction of man from an immortal soul to a biological mechanism; the substitution of the idea of sex for the idea of romantic love; the vogue for debunking, particularly in biography.

Second, it has been an era of revolt and experiment in sex. We have heard much of the tyranny of marriage, and the dangers of being inhibited. In our conversation, our novels, our plays, we have cultivated frankness of speech till it verged on brutality.

Third, it has been the era of science enthroned and of religion dethroned. The Dayton trial dramatized a struggle that went on in countless minds. Never before has the public been so ready to accept uncritically new scientific doctrines and theories. While the churches have lost members, the psychoanalysts have had thousands at their feet.

Fourth, it has been an era of *laissez-faire* in the relation between politics and business, and of getting-rich-quick. The popular president has been the one who gave business its head, and did as little as possible to divert the public from its preoccupation with profits. Prosperity has become a religion, and Utopia is a place where every stock would make a ten-point gain every day. The mystical element in the American mind has done its dreaming about mergers and split-ups.

So much for the chief characteristics of the Post-War decade. Now for the signs of change.

The first two of these have been pointed out by Mr. Walter Lippmann. In 1928 he drew attention to two facts that showed how the wind was beginning to blow. The first was the overwhelming popu-

for acclaim of Lindbergh after his flight. The public had had too much idol-smashing. When a young man not only took their imagination with his daring but astonished them by behaving like a gentleman afterward, they worshipped him as only a people starved for heroes can worship. Here was a sign that synicism was waning.

The other sign was the withdrawal of Mr. Coolidge from the 1928 Presidential race. Perhaps, as Mr. Lippmann says, Mr. Coolidge withdrew because he realized that the days of *laissez-faire* were over. At any rate both Messrs. Hoover and Smith, the new candidates, believed that conditions could be improved if the Government did something about them.

These slight changes in the intellectual climate might have passed unnoticed had they not been followed by others.

There could hardly be a more definite sign that disillusion is dying than the tremendous success of Ramsay MacDonald's visit and the cordial reception given by thoughtful people to the out-and-out idealism of his message. Such idealism had not been known since the days of Wilson. The American people, one concluded, had begun to traffic in ideals again.

Only a few weeks later came the panic in the stock market. People learned that it is as easy to get poor quick as to get rich quick, and the speculator's Utopia vanished in the clouds. But the really impressive thing about the crash, from the point of view of my thesis, was the eagerness with which people turned to the Government for action and the vast sigh of relief with which they accepted the news that Mr. Hoover was going to take a hand in things. We heard little of the doctrine of "less government in business" when the President called together the industrial executives.

The widespread interest in Humanism is, I think, another sign for the weather prophets. It would be easy to overemphasize the importance of this religious movement. Nevertheless the establishment of Humanist churches, as well as the grateful acceptance of Mr. Lippmann's *Preface to Morals*, would suggest that the revolt against religion has passed through its first violent stage, and is now trying to answer the question, "What next?"

These are not the only signs of a change in the public temper. Let us list categorically a few others.

The excitement about sex problems seems to be abating. We have talked about sex so much that it is becoming an old story, and we tire quickly of old stories.

The vogue of the new psychologies is declining: if you doubt this, listen to the average intelligent dinner-table group discussing behaviorism or Gestaltism or the Adler theories.

The enthusiasm for brutal outspokenness on the stage is perhaps ebbing: was not part of the triumph of *Journey's End* due to its reticence, and to the fact that it depicted gentlemen—not muckers—at war?

There are those who see in the present flood of plays of the romantic-historical nature a sign that we are becoming less satisfied

that the romance of earlier days was all bunk. The people who used to read *The Mauve Decade* with a patronizing air are now greeting *Sweet Adeline* and *Sherlock Holmes* with sentimental wistfulness.

There are those who, like William Bolitho, think that the new skirt indicates a new trend in the relation between men and women. The short skirt, says Mr. Bolitho, was a symbol of woman's intimate companionship with man on a basis of friendly but unromantic comradeship, and the longer skirt is a token of her withdrawal to become once more the goal of romantic conquest. Again romance is in the offing.

I fully realize that this random collection of varied evidence proves nothing conclusively. I do think, however, that it indicates pretty clearly that we are on our way toward a time when cynicism and disillusion will be less general among thoughtful people; when the debate on the problems of sex will drop out of the headlines; when there will be less interest in debunking religion than in finding a religion which will satisfy the unchurched; when new scientific doctrines, particularly in the field of psychology, will meet with more cautious acceptance; when people will expect politics to be something more than the mere handmaid of business, and when business itself will be regarded with a more critical and analytical mind.—*Reader's Digest.*

A Significant Day in London City Temple

R. K. Marvin

Dr. Frederick W. Norwood, pastor of the London City Temple, returned to his pulpit to-day after a tour of several weeks in the United States and Canada in the interests of world peace. At the morning service the congregation was of moderate size, but in the evening, when it was announced that the pastor would refer to his trip overseas, every seat was filled even to the top gallery. Evening services at the Temple are generally more largely attended than those in the morning. But there were special reasons for the outpouring on this particular night. As Dr. Joseph Fort Newton chose to consider himself an ambassador from the people of America to the people of England in time of war, so now Dr. Norwood regards himself and is generally conceded to be the ambassador of England to America in the interests of world peace.

First impressions of the City Temple are not pleasing. Unattractive inside and out, it finds itself badly located, as do many city churches fifty or more years old, whose building committees could not prophesy the future and the shifting of population. But the buses cover old London pretty thoroughly, and many come long distances by them to attend the City Temple. The interior is dark and gloomy, and though the sun was shining outside, electric lights in abundance were needed to give visibility. The stranger at once is struck by two events. There is rather more ritual in the service than one would expect to find in the fountainhead of Nonconformity. This only adds to the beauty of the service, however. Then the congregational sing-

ing! It is spontaneous and hearty beyond any I ever heard. The Gypsy Smith revival meetings at Tremont Temple could not equal it, though every inducement was offered in Boston and none in London to get the people warmed up.

In rising to preach Dr. Norwood expressed his gladness on his return to his church and people, referred to the rough voyage which landed him barely in time to preach, and made a brief reference to religious conditions as he had found them in the United States. He said: "America seems to be partly in the clutch of humanism. On my previous visit, it was behaviorism. America is always exploiting some big word. I wonder what it will be next. These things do not require faith in God." This was his only comment, spoken blandly and smilingly. Then he proceeded to preach a convincing sermon on the priority of God and His presence in all evolving life as his answer to the modern "isms." As he witnessed powerfully to the old verities one was reminded of Tennyson's stanza:

> Our little systems have their day,
> They have their day and cease to be;
> They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O God, art more than they.

Nearly every one at the morning service returned in the evening and there were new additions. There were many tense and dramatic moments, as when Dr. Norwood detailed what might happen in case of war between Great Britain and the United States. He said: "In all my wanderings in the United States and Canada I always felt I had the sympathy and prayers of the people. I have traveled 17,000 miles and spoken directly to 50,000 people, indirectly on the radio to millions more, to whom I have carried the message of peace dear to our hearts in City Temple and equally so to those on the American continent. Extravagant hospitality and genial friendship have been my personal lot. I went west to Chicago, then San Francisco, to Vancouver and Montreal, by courtesy of the railroad companies and without paying a cent of carfare. The trans-Atlantic company gave us (Mrs. Norwood went with him) the best suite of rooms on board at minimum cost. All this was not for me personally, but an expression of interest in the cause I conveyed.

"Simultaneous with my mission the Five Powers were meeting in London to reduce armaments. That was one reason why I went at this time. I found in the States that the meeting of their President and the Prime Minister had made a great impression on the masses of the people. I found the feeling between the two great nations never so kindly as to-day. They say as we say concerning any war between the two countries, 'Impossible!' But they know also, as we do, that nothing is impossible if two nations get started on a race in competitive armament. They know as we know such a rivalry would be a catastrophe. I pointed out to them as I often have here how relatively little ships have to do in modern times to win wars. Every year thirteen million tons of necessities come to our island from the United States. This is much more than from any other country. In

case of war between us, the greater part of those goods would never reach us. They would never even be placed on ships at all. Lack of these food-stuffs would bring us nearer to starvation in a short time than the four years of German submarine warfare waged against us. Of what use would our navy be if that food were even got on any ships? Then America could send an army into Canada. There are few fortresses on the frontier—a good thing in times of peace but a horrible thing to contemplate in time of war, worse than the invasion of Belgium. What could our army do about that? Then ships could be sent to the West Indies to stop our imports from there, nor could our navy do much to prevent.

"Then what could we do to the United States, for we are not dead yet! We have never been beaten. True, they remind us of a little skirmish between us once, but we were caught off guard that time. Even if we were beaten, we would never know it. Almost all the rubber comes from the British Empire. In case of war, none would go to the States. What would they do then? Almost all the tin comes from our Empire. What would the States do about it? And so one might go on. What could the ships of the United States Navy do?

"Moreover, Great Britain and the United States are responsible for the world's banking systems, and credit would be stopped around the world if these two nations came to war. Unemployment would be universal. Women and children would grow under-nourished and sickly. What could ships and armaments do about that? They would go looking for each other on the Atlantic, gain an occasional victory, wave flags at home, make speeches, award medals and pass resolutions! That is how we have read history in the past. We don't read it that way now. To read it that way now is simply to conform the opinion of that great American philosopher, Henry Ford, who said, 'History is the bunk.' Both nations have reached the point when war reckoned in terms of numbers of people slaughtered is beside the point, but hunger and unemployment are the unshaken facts. I found intelligent people understood this.

"In the midst of my campaign came the crux of the situation. This is the difference of opinion that has arisen between France on the one hand and the United States and Great Britain on the other. France is thinking in terms of submarines rather than cruisers and destroyers. The war left the full use of submarines in doubt. France recently launched a submarine that can go 12,000 miles, or four times across the Atlantic, without refueling. France calls the submarine the weapon of the weaker nation. What is true of submarines is true of aeroplanes. We don't know yet their full significance. We think only in terms of the last war. No one knows the strategy of the 'next war.'

"That's where we stand now. There are two policies here. If France prevails and increases the number of submarines, then there will be a demand for increase all along the line, and what becomes of reduction of armament and parity between the States and Britain? Then we may see the paradox of a conference called for reduction of

armaments ending in the increase of it! That is the state of affairs now. It may all be altered in a day or a week. Really there is no such thing as parity. Geography and the human equation render parity an uncertain quantity. A nation may have the strongest army, as Germany did, but even that doesn't spell security. What we need is the Kellogg Pact, a covenant of nations saying we will not fight you nor any other nation. And still the nations are preparing war! Against what, or whom, if not each other? Is it against some comet in the sky? We want some one to ask bluntly: 'Against whom are you preparing?' The nation that answers that question will have to answer before the judgment seat of humanity. If France chooses to stand out, let her answer to civilization.

"It has been said that if this London conference breaks down, chaos will result. No! The same thing was said when the Geneva Conference broke down. If this one fails at London, we'll have another, perhaps in Berlin. No one believes in the old system any more. If any statesman in the world dares now to speak for humanity, he will be heard. He may be thrown out of office, but not for long. He may meet obloquy to-day. But he will find immortality to-morrow. The law for renouncing war can be made operative.

"Here are the two alternatives—to go after each other to master each other in making the implements of war; or stand by the new law and have faith in our common humanity. May the two great English-speaking nations give the world that leadership in peace that it is waiting and praying for."

So ended a memorable address. One may not agree with all its statements, but it was easy to detect a soul throbbing with the pulsation of peace and goodwill for all mankind. There was no question his audience was with him from start to finish. It was good to have been among those present on this prophetic occasion. Later, we were permitted to wander around the edifice, and view the tablet to the Rev. Joseph Parker, D.D., pastor for thirty-three years, under whose pastorate the Temple was built. A remarkable bust of him stands in the vestibule. The church calendar noted the fact that Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick has asked Dr. Norwood to exchange pulpits with him six weeks every summer. While for obvious reasons it can not be consummated this coming summer, undoubtedly the future will witness these two mighty preachers of world peace carrying their messages across the ocean as ambassadors of the new and better day.

London, March 9, 1930. *Christian Leader.*

Friends of India: Sane and Crazy

Twenty-seven years ago Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe went out to India and became editor of an influential journal in Calcutta. After a service of five years he left, but ever since he has kept in close touch with Indian affairs. During his time in India he saw the end of the old imperialism and the beginning of the Swaraj, or Home Rule Movement. In his editorial work he helped end the old imperialism and helped spread the home rule movement.

A member of the British Labor Party, with a record of steadfast devotion to the masses, he can not be accused of being an enemy of liberty anywhere. Therefore his recent address upon India at the Community Church of Boston is one to be studied with care.

In substance he tells us that the battle for liberty in India is over. She has won her fight for home rule. The one question before us is how will she take what she has won. A constitution must be drafted and agreed to by the various parties in India. This is not as easy as it sounds. The parties are many, and bitterly opposed to each other. There are differences of races and religions. But Mr. Ratcliffe believes it can be done and that the first practical step toward it is the round table conference suggested by the Governor General with the backing of the Government of Great Britain.

Mr. Ratcliffe recognized the danger of catastrophe. He said frankly that the way in which the Simon Commission was appointed and the Mayo book have contributed most to this crisis. But he believes that intelligence and good will can find a way out of the impasse, preserve all that is valuable in the past and help India take her place in the British Commonwealth of nations with all the liberty of Canada and Australia.

Of the Mayo book, without passing judgment on its truth or falsity, he said: "Its publication was an imperial and international event of lamentable character. It so poisoned the atmosphere that co-operation between British and Indian leaders for the time became impossible."

After pointing out the difficulties Mr. MacDonald has faced as the head of a minority government and the burdens that office has brought to him, he said that the Prime Minister had done three important things regarding India:

1. He entrusted the Indian office to one of the ablest of Colonial administrators, Wedgewood Benn. 2. He summoned the Governor General to England for conference. 3. He authorized Lord Irwin to make a declaration supplementary to that of 1917 to the effect that dominion status is the natural issue of British rule in India, and to issue the invitation for a round table conference. "There is only one alternative," he said, "to violent revolutionary action, and that is conference."

For Mr. Gandhi in his own field of social and spiritual inspiration, Mr. Ratcliffe had only words of praise. Of Mr. Gandhi the political leader he spoke with more reserve. He asked us to read Mr. Gandhi's views as given in a recent book by Gandhi's close friend, C. F. Andrews. Gandhi would have India cut loose from all the body of scientific knowledge the Western world has gained. He would have men renounce all natural tendencies. Told that this would mean the end of human life, Gandhi replied, "Only on this earth plane."

Mr. Ratcliffe spoke of the wisdom of Gandhi's spinning wheel movement, and what this would mean back in the remote districts, but showed the inevitable drift in India toward Western knowledge. "The educated classes of India," he said, "will not turn away from science." Speaking of the famous incident when the Mahatma under-

went an operation for appendicitis at the hands of a British surgeon, Mr. Ratcliffe said, "Not even a Mahatma can refuse the gifts of knowledge and science."

In another striking part of Mr. Ratcliffe's address he struck off the phrase: "India must take the results of modern knowledge and apply them to the ending of powerlessness and poverty."

To those who insist that England has only to get out of India forthwith and without conditions, Mr. Ratcliffe said that the business of government is not so simple as that. There are bonds which England has given to millions called the untouchables, those regarded by the ruling classes as outcasts, and who now have direct representation in councils. There are constant efforts needed to keep peace between eighty million Mohammedans and two hundred million Hindus.

"The reason for British power in India to-day," said Mr. Ratcliffe, "is not military strength. She has but 60,000 English troops and a native army of 250,000. Her strength lies in her record of building up a system of administration which can not be hastily ended without terrible loss to India. It lies even more in the great men, known and unknown, like the surgeon who operated on Gandhi, who have unselfishly served India generation after generation."

Mr. Ratcliffe's recognition of what he called ghastly mistakes in British administration in the past, his perfect frankness, high ability, and noble spirit, made a marked impression. He quite won the large congregation, although of course there were those who rose in the question period so hostile and fanatical that they could see nothing good in what he had said. "India must be free," said one woman, "even though it costs the life of every man, woman and child in the country." That is easily said, especially as the lives such a person dedicates are lives far away across the sea.

Far better is it to co-operate in a world crisis so that India may be free without any sacrifice of human life.

It is men like MacDonald and Ratcliffe who are contributing to this end.—*Christian Leader.*

Vom Weltprotestantismus der Gegenwart.

1. Die kommende Lambeth-Konferenz.

Die kommende Lambeth-Konferenz ist ein so wichtiges kirchliches Ereignis, daß sie ein gründliches Studium, eine Stellungnahme, ja eine geistige Mitarbeit erfordert, in der Erfassung der Probleme, die sich nun deutlich heraus zu kristallisieren beginnen. Es ist nicht etwa nur die gegenwärtige anglikanische Problematik, die an dieser Konferenz sichtbar wird und nach Lösung verlangt, sondern es handelt sich gleichzeitig um das Schicksal der englischen Reformation, um Lebensfragen der Missionskirchen, um das Verhältnis zu Rom und zu den östlichen Kirchen und letzten Endes um die ökumenische Bewegung selbst.

An dieser Konferenz entscheidet es sich nämlich, ob der leitende Akzent in der anglikanischen Kirche endgültig auf die katholische oder auf die evangelische Note gesetzt wird. Hier findet für die Kirchengeschichte Englands eine

eigentliche Weichenstellung statt, die dazu führen kann, daß die anglikanische Kirche zu einer wirklichen „Brückenkirche" wird, oder daß sie einem exklusiven kirchlichen Aristokratismus entgegen geht. Hier wird entschieden, ob die Missionskirchen auch als Kirchen die enge Verbindung mit dem westlichen Christentum finden, oder hoffnungslos und enttäuscht in Zukunft ihren Weg allein suchen müssen. An dieser Lambeth-Konferenz endlich entscheidet es sich, ob die ökumenische Bewegung kirchliche Weite und eigentlichen Tiefgang gewinnt, oder ob es zu dem Ruf kommen wird: Israel, hebe dich zu deinen Hütten: Wenn der Anglikanismus auf dieser Konferenz sich nicht kräftig hinter die ökumenische Bewegung stellt, so wird der Protestantismus zwangsläufig zur Bildung einer besondern und geschlossenen Welteinheit getrieben und wird es andern kirchlichen Gemeinschaften überlassen, welche Freundschaften und Affinitäten sich neben ihm noch bilden mögen. **Man kann gerade auf diesen Punkt nicht nachdrücklich genug hinweisen.**

Die Lambeth-Konferenz kann zu einem breiten und tiefen Strom werden, der wie der Nil befruchtet. Er kann aber auch zerstörend über die Grenzen treten und weithin Enttäuschung in Feldern zerstörter Hoffnung zurücklassen.

Die Lambeth-Konferenz ist eine Versammlung von anglikanischen Bischöfen der ganzen Welt, ohne irgendwelche kanonische und kirchenrechtliche Bedeutung. Trotzdem ist ihr moralisches und religiöses Gewicht außerordentlich groß. Schon jetzt arbeiten die bedeutendsten kirchlichen Persönlichkeiten in verschiedenen Kontinenten, einzelne Gruppen und auch die englischen Kirchen selbst mit an der geistigen Leistung, die von der Konferenz zu erwarten ist. Bereits ist eine ganze Literatur zu dieser kommenden Konferenz entstanden, unter der ich besonders die Darstellung und Dokumente der bisherigen Lambeth-Konferenzen von Lord Davidson, dem bisherigen Erzbischof, hervorhebe, sowie Darstellungen einzelner Probleme oder geschichtlicher Aspekte durch Rev. Williams, Dr. Bell, Sidney Dark, Bischof Gore, Rev. Shephard oder durch die einzelnen Gruppen, die die Problematik der Konferenz bestimmen. Es sind vor allem die Gruppen der „Modern Churchmen" und der Anglo-Katholiken, zu denen eine eigentlich liberale und eine streng evangelische Gruppe stößt.

Die Konferenz wird im Juli in London eröffnet, gewöhnlich mit einer feierlichen Sitzung in Canterbury, wo der Erzbischof vom Stuhl des Heiligen Augustinus herab (natürlich nicht des Kirchenvaters) diese Vertreterversammlung des gesamten Anglikanismus begrüßt. Die Verhandlungen pflegen in London im Lambeth-Palace stattzufinden. Dessen Gemächer prangen in der Pracht alter Bildnisse früherer würdevoller Kirchenfürsten, darunter solche von Holbein gemalt.

370 Bischöfe aus allen Teilen der Welt sind eingeladen. Die englischen Bischöfe bilden natürlich nur einen kleinen Teil der imposanten Versammlung gegenüber der Hauptmasse, die aus den übrigen Teilen des britischen Weltreichs kommt. Darunter ist eine ganze Anzahl hervorragender Köpfe. An der letzten Lambeth-Konferenz hatte der bisherige Erzbischof, Lord Davidson, eine überragende Stellung. Sein Gewicht wird auch jetzt noch fühlbar sein. Sein majestätischer Blick dringt durch ein wahres Gebüsch tief herabhängender Augenbrauen und läßt den Besucher nur ahnen, welche Weisheit und Vorsicht hinter diesen tiefliegenden Augen walten.

Vorsicht vor allem — das ist die eigentliche Weisheit eines Erzbischofs von Canterbury, und auf seinem Siegelring darf sicher nichts andres stehen, als was auf dem Spinozos stand: „Prudenter." Der jetzige Erzbischof, Dr. Lang, wird wohl nicht dieselbe Führergewalt beanspruchen und wirkt mehr durch Güte und verstehende Liebe. Dagegen wird der jetzige Erzbischof von York, Dr. Temple, an dieser Konferenz wohl zu einer großen Führergestalt heraufwachsen. Er ist der soziale Erzbischof und schafft mit seiner sprudelnden Impulsivität und einem angriffigen Verstand das Gegengewicht zur Vorsicht, die Erbgut des Stuhles von Canterbury ist. Neben ihm wird der Einfluß der Anglo-Katholiken sich geltend machen in der Wirkung von Bischof Gore, des Gentleman-Bischofs, und des Bischofs von London, Dr. Winnington Ingram und Dr. Frere, des Mönch-Bischofs von Truro. Ihnen stehen Führer des modernen Anglikanismus gegenüber, wie der Bischof von Durham Henley Henson, ein Kampf-Bischof mit scharfem, treffendem Witz, gern gesehen auf protestantischen Konferenzen, wie erst kürzlich auf der schottischen Kirchenversammlung. Sodann der gelehrte Bischof von Birmingham, Dr. Barnes, der den liberalen Flügel darstellt und der Professor-Bischof von Gloucester, Dr. Headlam, (er äußert sich in einem eben erscheinenden Buche „Christian Unity" [„Chr. Student movement London 1930"] zur selben Frage), bisher tatsächlich ein Professor und manchmal ein Schulmeister in Hirtenschurz und Gamaschen der anglikanischen Bischöfe. Da die Konferenz aber weniger auf Kampf als auf Kompromiß angelegt ist, werden nicht die radikalen Stürmer vielleicht den größten Einfluß gewinnen, sondern Männer einer klugen Mitte, wie der Bischof von Winchester, der Bischof von Ripon und namentlich der Bischof von Chichester, Dr. Bell, dieser besonders durch genaueste Kenntnis der bisherigen Tradition und durch eine Vereinigung von undurchdringlicher Weisheit und unerschrockenem Mut.

Die Amerikaner werden einen Führer senden, der vielleicht weniger ein eigentlicher Führer, als ein Konservator ist: Dr. Manning, den Bischof von New York, daneben den feinen, aristokratischen Bischof von Rhode Island, de Wolf Perry, der soeben auf das Präsidialgehalt von 15,000 Dollars verzichtet hat und mit einem simpeln Bischofsgehalt von 7000 Dollars auskommen will. Der anglikanische Osten, Indien, wird durch Bischof Palmer, den bisherigen Bischof von Bombay, dessen Sprachfehler nicht die leiseste Minderung seines geistigen Einflusses bedeutet, sowie den eingeborenen Bischof von Dornakal, eine gewichtige Stimme erheben. Im Ganzen werden Schottland, Südafrika und ein Teil von Amerika starke anglokatholische Einflüsse auf den Schauplatz werfen, Irland eher liberal-evangelisch, und die weise Mitte wird überall zu finden sein.

2. Das Programm.

Die siebente Lambeth-Konferenz hat folgende Fragen zu behandeln:

1. Die christliche Lehre von Gott in ihrer Gegenüberstellung zur heutigen Gedankenwelt, zu den nicht-christlichen Religionen und in ihrer Bedeutung für die Gottesverehrung,

2. das christliche Leben unter besondrer Berücksichtigung der Ehe, der sexuellen Frage, der Rasse, der Regierung, des Kriegs, des Friedens,

3. die Einheit der Kirchen: Berichte und Antworten auf den Appell,

die Lausauner-Konferenz, Einigungspläne, Beziehung der englischen Kirchen zu den übrigen,

4. die anglikanische Gemeinschaft: ihr Ideal und ihre Zukunft, Organisation und Autorität,

5. das geistliche Amt,

6. die Jugend und ihre Berufung.

An diesen scheinbar harmlosen Fragen werden sich aber die eigentlichen Gegensätze innerhalb der Konferenz entzünden. Die Problematik der Konferenz liegt weniger in diesen offiziellen Themen, auch nicht in den Spannungen zwischen theologischen Richtungen, sondern in Gegensätzen, die durch folgende Gegenüberstellung charakterisiert werden können:

1. **Katholische und evangelische Auffassung der Kirche.** Der Kirchenbegriff der Anglo-Katholiken unterscheidet sich nicht von dem der römischen Kirche. Das einzige, was sie von Rom letzten Endes trennt, ist die Anerkennung der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes. Viele Vertreter dieser Gruppe würden ihn am Ende als Bischof von Rom, nicht aber als unfehlbaren Herrn des Glaubens anerkennen. Weder die Stellung Roms, noch die Ablehnung dieser Auffassung durch die evangelische Richtung läßt dieser Partei irgendeine Aussicht auf völlige Durchsetzung ihrer Auffassung.

2. Der zweite beherrschende Gegensatz innerhalb der Konferenz wird lebendig bei der Behandlung der südindischen kirchlichen Einigungsvorschläge, über die bereits früher berichtet worden ist. (Siehe 1929 Nr. 17 „Der Einigungsplan für die südindischen Kirchen." 1930 Nr. 4 „Um den südindischen Unionsplan.") Hier handelt es sich im letzten Grund um die Frage, ob das Bischofsamt zum „esse" oder zum „bene esse" der Kirche gehört. Die katholisierende Richtung fürchtet von der Annahme der südindischen Einigungsvorschläge eine Erschleichung des geistlichen Amts auf anderm Weg, als durch bischöfliche Weihe. Dadurch müßte die apostolische Sukzession unterbrochen werden, die heute fatalerweise geradezu das Schibboleth der anglikanischen Kirche zu werden droht, wie das auch die heftige Auseinandersetzung zwischen den amerikanischen Blättern „Christian Century" und „The Living Church" zeigt. Das hartnäckige Festhalten an dieser Lehre wird verständlich als ein innerer Protest der anglikanischen Bischöfe gegen die Investiturgewalt des Staates, etwa eines jüdischen Premiers, der die Bischöfe bestellt. Mit dieser Lehre gewinnen sie wenigstens eine geistige Unabhängigkeit von der weltlichen Macht.

3. Der dritte Gegensatz betrifft die Stellung zu den Sakramenten, namentlich zum heiligen Abendmahl. Sie ist zwar im Programm ebenso wenig erwähnt, wie der Streit um das „Prayer Book," aber selbstverständlich reichen die Grenzlinien des Streites um das „Prayer Book" auch in die Konferenz hinein und scheiden die Lager streng voneinander. Auf der einen Seite die Reservationisten, die die Abendmahlselemente aufbewahren wollen, um ihnen womöglich Verehrung zu zollen. Auf der andern Seite die Protestanten, die das zwar nicht mehr eine „vermaledeite Abgötterei" nennen würden, aber doch einen papistischen Sauerteig, den sie nicht dulden wollen. Der Bischof von Birmingham ist kürzlich daher mit dem Gesetz und dem Bischof von Truro in Konflikt gekommen und will lieber ins Ge-

fängnis gehen, als einen Priester einsetzen, der sich dem klaren Parlamentsentscheid widersetzt.

In diesen Spannungen wird mehr sichtbar als nur der alte Gegensatz zwischen „High" und „Low Church", auf die man manchmal, mit der „Broad Church" in der Mitte, allzu leicht die Gegensätze zurückführt. Ein Witzbold beschrieb diese, indem er sagte, es gebe in der anglikanischen Kirche drei Richtungen; die „attitudinarians" (die eine hochkirchliche Pose einnehmen), die „latitudinarians" (die verschwommenen Weitherzigen) und die „platitudinarians" (die Flachköpfe); aber letzten Endes liegt das Problem doch tiefer für die gesamte kirchliche Welt. Es liegt in der Frage, wieviel alter Katholizismus in den Reformationskirchen noch Platz haben oder wieder neu aufgenommen werden kann, nachdem die Reformation gleichsam ihre Funktion erfüllt hat und der Protestantismus nicht mehr nötig hat, in einer bloßen Proteststellung zu verharren. **Hier muß die ganze protestantische Welt aufhorchen.** Rom braucht das nicht zu tun, nachdem es in der Enzyklika „Apostolicae curae" die anglikanischen Weihen für null und nichtig erklärte und dem Gespräch von Mecheln den Lebensfaden abschnitt. Aber der evangelischen Welt wird hier mit dieser Lambeth-Konfrenz eine Frage gestellt, wie wir sie von römischer Seite nicht direkt entgegennehmen können. Denn das Festhalten des Anglikanismus an wertvollen alten, katholischen Elementen zwingt auch den Protestantismus auf den großen Weltkonferenzen zu einer ernstlichen, neuen Auseinandersetzung mit dem ursprünglichen Katholizismus. Das eigentliche Gespräch mit Rom, das der Protestantismus seit 400 Jahren fortsetzt, wird daher heute weniger direkt von der einen zur andern Kirche, als in dem ungeheuern weltkirchlichen Konferenzsaal des Anglikanismus geführt.

Darum sind wir an dieser Konferenz aufs lebhafteste interessiert. Wenn die Lambeth-Konferenz durch eine Bestätigung der früheren Anerkennung des evangelischen Amts, durch eine Annahme der südindischen Einigungsvorschläge den weiteren Weg öffnet für eine Vereinigung der Anglikaner und englischen Non-Konformisten, so wird das nicht nur für den englischen Missionsprotestantismus die größten Folgen haben, sondern für die gesamte protestantische Welt und die Einigungsbewegung überhaupt.

Zum Glück beansprucht auch eine Lambeth-Konferenz nicht Unfehlbarkeit. Das berühmte Lambeth-Viereck kann also nötigenfalls revidiert werden. Oder es kann ihm doch eine Auslegung gegeben werden, die Brücken baut, und das Brückenbauen wird ja von dieser Kirche als besondre Kunst beansprucht. Die „Church Times" sagt von der anglikanischen Kirche, sie besitze den **„Genius des Kompromisses."** Das ist nicht gerade ein aristokratischer Genius neben dem Genius der Herrschaft, den die römische Kirche besitzt, und dem Genius märtyrermutiger Wahrhaftigkeit mancher protestantischer Kirchen. Aber vielleicht kann allein dieser Genius, wenn es wirklich einer ist, verhindern, daß die anglikanische Kirche auseinander fällt und ein Teil den Weg geht, den Kardinal Newman gegangen ist. Die Gegensätzlichkeit der Konferenz kann daher auch in die Frage gekleidet werden: Wollen wir in einer Kirche zusammenbleiben, oder wollen wir auseinander gehen? Wollen wir eine breite „Comprehensive Church," in der viele Wohnungen sind, oder wollen wir eine gereinigte und exklusiv erstarrte Kirche,

die das Sektentum in der Welt vermehrt? Sind die heterogenen geistigen Elemente innerhalb dieser Kirche Salz oder ein Gift?

Vieles hängt von der Beantwortung dieser Fragen ab. Der Anglikanismus hat heute eine solche Bedeutung innerhalb des gesamten Christentums, daß auch die übrigen Kirchen im Geist an dieser Konferenz teilnehmen und im Gebete ihr jenen Geist der Weisheit und der Wahrheit, der Liebe und der Brüderlichkeit wünschen dürfen, die von oben stammen.

Genf. Adolf Keller, in „Christl. Welt."

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

Theism and the Modern World, by *Walter Marshall Horton,* Oberlin College. With an introduction by W. A. Brown, Union Theological Seminary. Harper Bros. Publishers, 1930. 189 pages, $2.00.

The war did more than unsettle dynasties and rearrange the map of Europe. It played havoc with the moral and religious convictions of the age. Before the war we had endowed God with the attributes of an American parent, gentle, lenient, easy-going; only too ready to reward honest effort, and very disinclined to severity. The war changed that. Vast calamities fell upon the earth and God never interfered. Was he then not almighty or was he not the God of love? Some helped themselves with the conception of a finite God, a God who needs us to make this a better world. Others gave up their faith in God altogether. The conceptions of religion are according to these personifications of human ideals. All there is of God is the moral and religious life of the individual and of groups. There is no God apart from man and his feelings of reverence, love and aspiration. There is no hereafter, no immortality. It all begins and ends with man. This view of life is therefore properly called *Humanism.* It has found its chief adherents (Dr. Dietrich and others) in the Unitarian Church.

To the ordinary Christian such a bare denial of the fundamental religious convictions seems shocking. The author, nevertheless, sets out to see whether we cannot, while holding onto our theistic faith, find common ground with the humanist in some respects. The spirit of skepticism has spread far and a desire for sympathetic understanding may be better than harsh condemnation.

Let us remember that modern heresies are but old foes in new garb. The leading issues of the day spring from long-standing issues of the past. Humanism is not simply a product of the war. It connects up with problems that began to be agitated already at the awakening of the modern era. "Renaissance humanism, 18th century humanitarianism, 19th century positivism, expressing itself in the 'religion of humanity'—there in a nutshell you have the historical antecedents of the present humanist movement, and there you have also the pilgrimage of the modern spirit." While Renaissance humanism looked to classical antiquity for light and guidance, present-day humanism looks to psychology and the social sciences. The scientific method must be applied to all areas of human thought. What cannot stand this test is to be abandoned.

If the Humanists claim that the God idea is wholly a product of imagination, one feels at once that they overstate the case outrageously. Because some conceptions of the deity are faulty or inadequate, it does not follow that all faith in God is without foundation. In the light of its universality and of what it has done for man, it would be preposterous to deny to it all reality. Have we not a right to trust in the validity of the God idea when faith in God has been a mighty factor in human experience? Here the author describes the case of a man like Tolstoi. When 50 years of age, he arose, from a period of absolute doubt, to one of personal and powerful faith. He found that God was he, without whom one cannot live. In the words of the author: That God was his own better self; that God is all that is best in our human heritage; that God is a vast human drift or trend toward harmony, fellowship and mutual aid, whereby our efforts to create a just equilibrium in human affairs are supported and sustained. The author claims that the existence of such a drift is not only an act of faith but an empirical fact which can be verified, or is at least so highly probable that it is practically without dispute. Personality and omnipotence are not included in the concept.

The believer in the God of Christian experience doubtless finds the conception of a "cosmic drift" very inadequate as an expression of what God is to him. To him God is not a drift but a personality or a super-personality, endowed with divine greatness and divine goodness, and Jesus Christ the one in whom all things consist, who is the redeemer of man and of society. But if that is his Christian overbelief, it finds in the drift idea a support which seems to have the facts of nature and human experience on its side.

The author has labored hard to show that it is entirely reasonable to hold the faith in God and yet have an open mind for all the teaching of science. And, furthermore, that much in the Christian faith can well hold its own against all that skeptics, materialists, positivists and rationalists have to say. Still he can lead his readers only to probability. There may be a God, almighty and loving, and a Christ his highest revelation so far. But there is no certitude. Such a position is wholly unsatisfactory. The apostles could not have conquered if that had been their view. The Reformers—and all Christian leaders in the great epochs of history—were absolutely sure of their ground. And these were the elements of their God-consciousness: their personal experience of a saving God; the testimony of scripture, especially the teachings of Christ; and the experience of the church in all ages.

The author is well acquainted with the "modern mood" and its preferences, its objections and its strivings. He notes the trend towards mysticism; the desire for better forms of worship; the quest for religious certitude; the urge for self-realization. He quotes freely from the rich literature on his subject and kindred matters. The book is not just easy reading, but it expresses well the position of the liberal theologian who gives to science all it can claim—and perhaps a little more—and is yet unwilling to give up anything of real value in the Christian heritage.

John Wesley, by *Arnold Lunn.* With a Foreword by S. P. Cadman. The Dial Press, New York, 1929. 371 pages, $4 00.

This biography is, according to Dr. Cadman, a twentieth century estimate of J. Wesley, and one, he adds, that is "more than likely to prevail with the oncoming generation." The author is an Anglican and as such he writes with the necessary detachment. He likes to point out that the difference between Wesley, the Methodist, and Wesley, the Anglican, was after all not so great; that his conversion did not break the continuity of his religious life and that he never intended to start a new church but only a society or order in the old. At the same time, the writer has a due appreciation of the greatness of his hero and of the importance of the contribution Methodism made to England and the English-speaking world. He says, J. Wesley was, perhaps, the greatest Englishman of his age. He endorses Lecky's statement that Methodism had saved England from revolution. The England of his day was almost wholly given to material interests. Its moral condition was low—witness the literature of the day, e. g. the novels of J. Fielding. There had hardly ever been such indifference to spiritual things as in that era of Rationalism and Deism. J. Wesley and kindred spirits brought about a revival that was as deep as it was far-reaching and permanent. These things are facts of the moral and religious history of the country and ought to be just as well considered and explained as the facts of the natural world.

The author gives an interesting description of Wesley's development. We naturally get much that is well known, but also many incidents, well authenticated and worthy of note, that are new.

Wesley's mother was the 25th child of her parents. From her Wesley received his sense of vocation. His early life and, especially, his Oxford period, are dwelt on with great care. His conversion, brought about by his reading Luther's preface to Romans (and Peter Bochler's earlier influence) is vividly told.

The point is made that "the Wesley's in belief, assertion and practice were always sacramentalists of a comparatively High Church type, and wished their people to be the same." This, it is said, was true after 1738 (the conversion) as well as before. He maintained his early Oxford (religious) club habits through life and so became "the most useful saint in the British empire." In this club he was and remained the dominating leader, but he had great helpers in kindred spirits. Here his brother Charles, the poet, and Whitfield, the impassioned orator, are mentioned. The author seems to us to give the latter less recognition than is his due.

A number of chapters are now devoted to the great revival that broke out as a result of the preaching of these earnest souls. It began with field preaching. Since the churches were forbidden them, they resorted to the open air. It is well known how the common people heard them gladly, how they came by the thousands and how deep was the effect on the popular mind. The preaching of Whitfield was very emotional. The feelings of the multitude often got out of con-

trol altogether, but Wesley always knew how to check them. To him the nature of the emotions was always to be judged by the permanent effects on character and life.

Wesley had now come to believe that the world was his parish, at least the English world. His travels through America, his daily work, his journal, his loves and his marriage are described.

Finally his theology (the "Mind of Wesley"). Wesley had always been a scholar, a keen logical thinker, an independent religious leader. Nevertheless he never made a great contribution to systematic theology. While he stood firmly on scriptural ground and was always able to give a good account of his belief and practice, religion was to him life. In "opinions" he was little interested. The Christian religion was to him faith in the love of God, and this faith produced the new life of obedience and trust in God. The love of God was shed abroad in the regenerated Christian. Methodism's mission was to spread the contagion of holy living in the world, not to build a new creed or a new system of doctrines.

Wesley's belief in the literal inspiration of the bible was responsible for some survivals of strange or even revolting views in his teaching. See e. g. his sermon on hell (text Mark 9: 48: the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched). Here he paints the horrors of hell in all their terribleness. The doctrine of everlasting punishment, according to the author the most damnable of all Christian teachings, seemed to him based on the ipsissima verba of Christ. If Protestantism had only, continues the writer, rejected the hell fire and accepted the purgatory of Catholicism!

Wesley, to the end of his life, so does the writer delight in emphasizing, remained a High church man. He thoroughly believed in the episcopacy and hated dissenters. The liturgy and the prayer book of the Church of England he prized highly. He never had any design of separating from the Church. He lived and died a member of the Church of England, and none, he said, who regard my judgment will ever separate from it.

Well, the author brings out again and again his strong preference for his Anglican Church. History, however, cannot be stopped by hereditary loyalties. It has a way of bursting old limitations and shaping new channels for mighty movements. So the Methodist Church left the mother's house and built one of her own, and the spirit and legacy of its founder enabled it not only to become the largest Protestant denomination in this country but also the most influential.

A delightful book on a great subject, written with fullest information and warm-hearted sympathy.

Livingstone, by *R. J. Campbell, D.D.* A new biography with hitherto unpublished material. With illustrations. New York. Dodd, Mead and Company, 1930. 295 pages.

Sixty years ago the first official life of Livingstone came out. After the lapse of sufficient time to permit a well balanced and impartial

account of the great explorer's life and work to be written, here comes Dr. Campbell's book. He is far enough away from his hero's time to avoid indiscriminate adulation; he has also had access to a considerable amount of new material, such as the "Locked Journal" and other sources. Besides he writes with great skill and natural ability in showing what manner of man he was "whose spiritual force and moral grandeur were unequaled in his generation" (London Times, October 31, 1929).

Livingstone occupies an even higher place to-day in the esteem of students of social history than he did at the close of his career. He must be counted as one of the foremost pioneers of a new age. This book analyzes the factors that contributed to making him what he was—his dogged courage, his principles and prejudices, his life-long struggle against the narrowness in his fellow-workers, and the innumerable dangers of the task to which he sacrificed his life.

The book shows him in his governmental, economic, educational and social activities, but it aims primarily at giving a *clear connected narrative of his life* in its *more personal aspects.* Livingstone is to-day a living memory in Africa. His character was the explanation of his lasting influence on the African soul. The book explains the process whereby he became to the Africans the embodiment of Christian love and the noblest specimen of humanity they had ever seen. We see the Scotch lad, poor but determined to overcome all handicaps. Early he was filled with the desire to alleviate human distress. Africa seemed to him the place where distress was greatest and help most urgently wanted. He acquired all the intellectual culture and the manual training needed to be of greatest benefit to the helpless races peopling that continent.

He gave his services to the London Missionary Society as a missionary. Still, he also fitted himself to be a physician in a land where doctors were non-existent. And the longer he worked at his task the wider his outlook became. He did the work of an explorer to throw the land open to commercial enterprise as well as to the labors of the missionary. As he went on he concentrated his efforts on the suppression of the African slave trade as carried on by the Sultan of Zanzibar and Arabian raiders. In this he was greatly successful in so far as he enlisted the cooperation of the English government in a relentless war on this inhuman traffic.

It is impossible to even sketch all the arduous labors he undertook, his many and eventful journeys, his discoveries, his indomitable energy, his sufferings, his ceaseless zeal in spite of sickness and hardships. His imperfections, impatience, harshness, indifference to privation of himself or others—even his own wife and children—all receive just and honest treatment. His career is full of romance and full of sacrifice. He reminds one of the apostle of the gentiles in his consecration and undying devotion to his task.

In his last chapter "The Harvest," the author attempts a delineation of Livingston's greatness in character and service. We commend this chapter to the careful perusal of the reader. It says in

closing: "On Livingstone's greatness as a missionary and an explorer all men are now agreed. Of the outstanding importance of his contributions to geology, botany, ethnology there is no need to argue, subsidiary though these were to his geographical discoveries. The dynamic he communicated to commercial enterprise was in itself enough to establish his claim to eminence during his life time and much more since. But far and away beyond all those is the heritage of his faith in righteousness and brotherly-kindness. The nineteenth century produced no greater moral force than he, and his propulsive energies show no sign of diminution. He has been the means of evoking more zeal for human welfare, more honest belief in the capacities of human nature, more unselfish willingness to labor in the cause of human emancipation from the shackles of hatred, and fear, and hoary antipathies than almost any single personal influence that could be named, certainly none other has been more fecund in operation. And the work goes on, and will go till the race of man has reached that inconceivably distant goal towards which all the men of vision of all generations have raised their eyes and led the way."

England: Its Character and Genius. By *Wilhelm Dibelius.* Translated by Mary Agnes Hamilton, M. P. (Harper. $5.00.)

It is a great tribute to this book that although it was written during the World War for Germans by the professor of English at Berlin, it can be published today for English readers and for the wider world and find ready acceptance as a work worthy to be classed with Bryce's study of the American Commonwealth. The comparison is a wholly appropriate one, for it has many of the qualities of Lord Bryce's famous work. There is no study of English history, literature, institutions, and character which can at all be compared with this interpretation offered by a German scholar. It is comprehensive, concerning itself both with outwardly observable facts capable of statistical statement and with the more intimate aspects of the Englishman's life and thought. It is fair even when most critical, and generous in unexpected ways. And while the author's aim has been to reach and state conclusions which will go far to explain what goes on in Britain's statecraft, in her foreign relations, in religion and education, in industry, in journalism, the reader is made to feel throughout that such conclusions rest upon definite study of matters of recorded fact.

The introduction contributed by the Master of Balliol College, Oxford, makes it very clear that one who is identified with English institutions can find in this work an illuminating interpretation of the English character. "The things about us that strike other people are mostly the things we ourselves so much take for granted that we are ourselves hardly conscious of them. All nations—but perhaps above all the English—are apt to take for granted that their own ways of doing things and of looking at the world are the natural and inevitable ways, and that foreigners are just funny." Dr. Lindsay finds much in the book to help Englishmen see themselves as others see them.

The quality thus generously recognized makes it especially valuable to other than Englishmen, and Americans will learn much of English character from Professor Dibelius that many visits to England might not teach them.

Of course there are Englishmen who would bitterly resent the conclusion that over against England's achievements must be set one fact that the world can not but regard as a source of danger, "the Englishman's one domineering quality, his lust for power." Herr Dibelius sees in this the basic fact of his character. "It appears not only in wars and forceful colonization, but quite as well in English home politics." This is, however, "not a mere force of destruction: wherever the Englishman appears as a conqueror, he will bring with him not only material benefits in abundance, but also his religious and high ethical sense in all questions which do not touch his sense of supremacy." The author distinguishes rather aptly the incidental benefits from the power by saying: "The Englishman is apt to point to this pleasant accompaniment, he is generally deaf to the tune. But it is the tune that grates upon the ears of others. . . . The achievements are not sufficiently unique to give the moral warrant for absolute world power." Elsewhere the author shows penetration in pointing out that "England's power always recognizes its own limits. That is why its effect, instead of being destructive merely, has always created fresh centers of power." This fact, which gives a distinctive character to what Herr Dibelius calls (in a war-time book, we may remember) the English "lust for power," raises the central issue now facing the British Empire. Can Britain accept this high destiny? Can she be content to have created fresh centers of power? Can she relinquish control when those on whom she has conferred power believe they are ready to use it under their own direction? The difficulties in the way are real. In the first place there are Englishmen who will suffer material loss if and when control is relinquished, for control means economic advantage for some one. In the second place there are other Englishmen who are very sure that native populations long under British rule are not yet ready for self government. These men, in all sincerity, can not accept the full implications of the liberal doctrine that to develop responsibility in others one must first give it. They are spiritual descendants of men who refused self-direction to the American colonies. In the meantime India feels humiliated by the delays in applying long-promised reforms. South Africa shows her sensitiveness by declaring her right to secede from the Empire at any time.

In the course of nine pages Herr Dibelius states the Indian problem with rare clarity. This section is indeed a masterly treatment in short compass of a complex problem. The historical background is sketched in, the inner meaning for both India and Britain is indicated fairly, the future is envisaged with good judgment. "If the Europeanization of India proceeds,—and, despite all Gandhi's efforts, all the evidence is that it will—the decline of imports of raw materials such as coal and low-grade textiles may well be compensated by an increase

in those of high-grade articles, since generations will have to pass before India can supply these needs from its home production." (We may pause to point out that these are "needs" only from the Western viewpoint; Gandhi's hope is that India, remaining truly Oriental, may repudiate any such "needs.") "So, while the number of English administrative officials goes down, that of engineers, forestry and technical experts will rise. . . . While a decline in British power in India is taking place, there is as yet no sign of its being driven out."

A fine passage (pages 502-3) which embodies a tribute to the healthy-mindedness of English life ends with a statement that the English state rests on two specifically English assumptions, common sense and the transformation of the antagonist into a privileged colleague. To the last words, all the more noble if they appeared in the original war-time edition, every lover of England will respond. Sportsmanship in games (recognition of the antagonist as a colleague) has stamped England's use of power. No greater evidence of this has been given the world than the attitude of England to Germany since the terrible years of recrimination and hate when the two empires fought for the supremacy of their very different ideals.

We have given this book extended space because it is an important contribution to the understanding of present issues of interest to the whole world. It describes and interprets a complex national character in the light of its history and its past, in the light of its profession and its ideals, in the light of its economic and political situation. The bibliography is a valuable survey of relevant literature. Every good library should possess this work.—*H. E. B. S.* in *Christian Leader.*

Breslau oder Missouri? Wo findet man die rechte lutherische Bekenntniskirche? Von Pastor A. Huebener. 190 S., M. 3. Verlag des Schriftenvereins (E. Klärner).

Obiges Schriftchen wird uns von dem genannten Verlag zur Besprechung zugeschickt. Es gibt in Deutschland eine Breslauische und eine sächsische Freikirche. Die letztere ist missourisch, die erstere ist nicht so schroff und sucht neuerdings Anschluß an oder Anerkennung durch die lutherische Landeskirche. Einer ihrer Pastoren, Dr. Slotty, hatte kürzlich eine Warnungsschrift gegen die sächsische Freikirche geschrieben: „Stellen die sogenannten Missourier die rechte lutherische Kirche dar?" Auf diese Schrift ist die hier vorliegende die Antwort.

Pastor Hübener, der Verfasser, sucht zu zeigen, daß Dr. Slotty nicht die rechte Stellung zur Schrift hat. Ihm ist sie lehrverpflichtendes Gotteswort, soweit sie Christum treibt. Den Missouriern ist sie Gotteswort von Anfang bis zu Ende, sie halten fest an der absoluten Verbalinspiration. Es gibt in ihr keine Stufen der Werthöhe.

Auch in Bezug auf die Glaubenslehre sind die Breslauer nach Slotty nicht lutherisch. Der Missourier lehrt, daß wenn ein Mensch zum Glauben kommt, es bloß Gottes Gnade ist, und wenn er verloren geht, es bloß seine eigene Schuld ist. Pastor Slotty dagegen will dem Menschen die Freiheit der Selbstbestimmung wahren. Besonders die Gnadenwahl erhält durch den Verfasser missourische Beleuchtung.